REPORT RESUMES

ED 012 716 SP 001 269

AN EVALUATION OF THE INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM.

BY- HARRIS, ALBERT J. AND OTHERS
CITY UNIV. OF NEW YORK, DIV. OF TEACHER EDUCATION

PUB DATE JUN 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.72 143P.

DESCRIPTORS- ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *GRADUATE STUDENTS, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, LIBERAL ARTS MAJORS, PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, *TEACHER CERTIFICATION, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER PERSISTENCE, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, *TEACHER RECRUITMENT, TEACHER SHORTAGE, PROGRAM EVALUATION, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM, NEW YORK CITY

TO HELP OVERCOME AN ANTICIPATED 3,000-TEACHER SHORTAGE DURING THE SUMMER OF 1966, THE NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION COLLABORATED WITH THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK ON AN INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM FOR LIBERAL ARTS GRADUATES, RECRUITED NATIONALLY. OF 2,100 SUCH PERSONS WHO ENTERED THE PROGRAM, 1,858 SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED IT, AND 1,629 ENTERED FULL-TIME TEACHING POSITIONS IN ADDITION TO ATTENDING A SPECIAL FALL SEMINAR. AT THE END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR, 1,583 WERE STILL TEACHING. MALES MADE UP 57 PERCENT OF THE PARTICIPANTS, 53 PERCENT OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TRAINEES, AND TENDED TO BE YOUNGER THAN THE PARTICIPATING WOMEN. ONE-THIRD OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAD RECEIVED BACHELOR'S DEGREES BEFORE 1960, WHILE 43 PERCENT WERE NEW DEGREE HOLDERS. SEVENTY-ONE PERCENT WERE BORN IN NEW YORK CITY, AND 52 PERCENT HAD ATTENDED COLLEGE THERE. MOST TRAINEES AND INSTRUCTORS FELT THAT THE PROGRAM SHOULD INCLUDE SOME FORM OF STUDENT TEACHING. MANY TRAINEES WERE CRITICAL OF THEIR ASSIGNMENTS AND THEIR PUPILS. THEIR PRINCIPALS RATED 52 PERCENT OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, 50 PERCENT OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, AND 21 PERCENT OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ASSIGNMENTS AS DIFFICULT. THE PRINCIPALS RATED 72 PERCENT OF THE TRAINEES AS AVERAGE OR ABOVE AS COMPARED TO OTHER NEW TEACHERS AND 9 PERCENT OF THEM AS UNSATISFACTORY. (RP)

ED012716

SP 001 269

copy 2

DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION
Of The
CITY UNIVERSITY
OF NEW YORK

AN EVALUATION OF THE INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM:

A Joint Project of The City University of New York and the Board of Education of The City of New York

Office of Research and Evaluation
Division of Teacher Education

Albert J. Harris, Director
Maurice A. Lohman, Principal Investigator
Nicholas Gavales
Frieda Kurash

June, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Preface

In the Spring of 1966 the Board of Education of the City of New York became aware that a serious shortage of teacher personnel was likely to occur the following September unless emergency measures were taken. With support available from the federal government, plans were instituted for the Intensive Teacher Training Program. An advisory committee was set up which included representatives of the Office of Personnel of the Board of Education, Board of Examiners, the Division of Teacher Education of The City University of New York, the School of Education of The City College, the United Federation of Teachers and the Council of Supervising Organizations of Metropolitan Teacher Education institutions. The City College agreed to provide the professional courses during the 1966 Summer Session and the following semester for as many as 3,400 trainees.

There was general agreement that an evaluation of this emergency program should be conducted. At the request of The City College, the Office of Research and Evaluation of the Division of Teacher Education agreed to take responsibility for the evaluation. It was May, 1966 before this agreement was concluded, and therefore, little time was available for planning the evaluation before the program actually started.

Professor Maurice A. Lohman and I have shared responsibilities for planning the evaluation and for the findings and conclusions of the present report. During the 1966 Summer Session Dr. Lohman and Mr. Nicholas Gavales, Research Assistant, worked full-time on evaluation and Dr. Leonard Alshan of The City College participated on a half-time basis. During the academic year 1966-67 Dr. Lohman devoted half-time to this evaluation, Mr. Gavales remained as full-time Research Assistant and Miss Frieda Kurash also participated as a Research Assistant, devoting more than half-time to this project. I wish to acknowledge the devotion of these staff members to the project and the high quality of their efforts.

This evaluation could not have been carried out without the help and cooperation of many people. Under Dean Harry N. Rivlin's authorization, Dean W. Virgil Nestrick gave wise leadership in the planning of the program and its beginning. Dr. Harold H. Abelson in his capacity as Dean of the School of Education at City College until August, 1966, and as Acting Dean of Teacher Education during 1966-67, gave generously of his time and provided a perspective that has been extremely helpful. At The City College Dean Doyle M. Bortner, Associate Dean Paul J. Burke and Assistant Dean Gerald Leinwand provided administrative support in addition to space and clerical assistance.

At the Board of Education Deputy Superintendent Theodore H. Lang, and Abraham Wilner, Assistant to Dr. Lang, were unfailingly helpful and offered the full cooperation of the Office of Personnel in the difficult task of locating each of the hundreds of trainees and keeping track of them. To Mr. Joseph A. Mandina and Mr. Gerald Brooks of the Office of Personnel, on whom many of the details fell, we also extend our thanks.

We wish to express our appreciation to the active participants--the instructors, the supervising principals, and above all the ITTP trainees, all of whom gave of their time and effort in supplying the information summarized within. We greatly appreciate the candor and sincerity with which so many wrote out their comments.

Finally, we would like to thank the office staff of the Office of Research and Evaluation for their work on this manuscript, and especially Mrs. Beatrice Tausek who typed the final version.

Albert J. Harris

June, 1967

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	1
	Nature of the Program	3
	Selection Procedures	4
	The Instructors	6
	Evaluation Procedures	8
	Procedures	10
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER-EDUCATION PROGRAMS	11
	References	24
III	THE TRAINEES	26
	Characteristics of the Group	26
	Attitudes toward Teaching	38
	Summary	39
IV	DATA CONCERNING THE SUMMER AND FALL PROGRAMS	40
	Summer Program	40
	Fall Seminars	41
	After-School Workshops	43
	Opinions of Trainees and Staff about the Summer Programs	44
V	ASSIGNMENTS OF TRAINEES	48
	Holding Power	51
VI	ANALYSIS OF TRAINEES' AND INSTRUCTORS' OPINIONS OF THE INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM	52
	Strengths	63
	Weaknesses	65
	Suggestions	70
	The Instructors' Opinions	73
VII	SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING	79
VIII	PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS	87

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued):

Chapter Page

IX SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 94
Summary 94
Additional Highlights 95
Discussion 96
Recommendations 98

Appendix

A APPLICATION MATERIALS
Letter to Prospective Teachers A-1
City College Application A-2
Statement of Commitment A-3
Procedure for Assignment A-4
Training Program for Newly Licensed Teachers A-5

B EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS
Inventory I B-1
Letter to ITTP Instructor B-2
Instructor Evaluation of Program B-3
Appointment Questionnaire B-4
Questionnaire for Teachers Who Have Discontinued Service in New York City Schools B-5
Letter to ITTP Graduate B-6
Inventory IV B-7
Inventory V B-8
Letter to Principals of All Day Schools B-9
Principal's Evaluation Questionnaire B-10

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Occupation of Instructors	7
2	Highest Earned Degree of Instructors	7
3	Enrollment Statistics	27
4	Sex of Trainees	27
5	Age of Trainees for Total Group	28
6	Age of Elementary Trainees	28
7	Age of Secondary Trainees	29
8	Year of B.A. Degree for Total Group	30
9	Year of B.A. Degree for Elementary Group	30
10	Year of B.A. Degree for Secondary Group	31
11	Place of Birth for Total Group	31
12	Residence Prior to ITTP Program	32
13	College of B.A. Degree	32
14	Highest Earned Degree for Total Group	33
15	Highest Earned Degree for Elementary Group	33
16	Highest Earned Degree for Secondary Group	34
17	Hours of Graduate Education for Total Group	34
18	Hours of Graduate Education for Elementary Group	35
19	Hours of Graduate Education for Secondary Group	35
20	Marital Status	36
21	Number of Women with Children Birth to 17 Years of Age	36
22	Number of Women with Children Below School Age (Birth to 5 Years)	37
23	Number of Women with Children of School Age (6 through 18 Years)	37
24	Employment Prior to ITTP	38

LIST OF TABLES (continued):

Table		Page
25	Reason for Withdrawal from Summer Program	40
26	Distribution of Grade Averages for Summer Program	42
27	Fall Assignments	43
28	Distribution of Grades for Fall Seminar	44
29	ITTP Assignments	49
30	Assignments by Borough	50
31	Analysis of the Strengths of the ITTP as Reported by ITTP Graduates Teaching in Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, High Schools, and Non-Public Schools	53
32	Analysis of the Weaknesses of the ITTP as Reported by ITTP Graduates Teaching in Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, High Schools, and Non-Public Schools	57
33	Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by Elementary and Secondary Level ITTP Instructors	74
34	Additional Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by Elementary Level ITTP Instructors	76
35	Additional Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by Secondary Level ITTP Instructors	77
36	Opinions about Beginning Teaching Experiences	80
37	Principals' Ratings of Teaching Competence	88
38	Principals' Ratings of Assignment	89
39	Second Semester Appointments to Same Assignments	89
40	Principals' Opinions and Observations of Trainees	91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Early in 1966 the New York City Board of Education anticipated the need for more than 3,000 teachers in addition to the normal supply of new teachers in the public and non-public schools of the city. In the public schools the additional teachers were needed to provide smaller classes, specialized teaching and guidance services, school library services, corrective and remedial reading teaching, and other educational services necessary for a program of quality-integrated education. In addition, remedial, guidance, and enrichment services were to be provided for disadvantaged children in non-public schools.

The Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP) was a joint enterprise of The City University of New York and the New York City Board of Education as a means of assisting the Board of Education in achieving its full complement of teachers for the 1966-67 school year. This was to be accomplished by providing to qualified college graduates, who had few or none of the professional education courses required of applicants for New York City teaching licenses, the opportunity to pursue an intensive program of studies during the summer of 1966. The summer program was to be followed by a seminar in problems of teaching to be conducted during the fall semester along with a special in-service orientation program, while the participants held full-time teaching assignments.

Funds for this program were obtained by the Board of Education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Public Law 89-10.

Upon successful completion of the summer program conducted by The City College School of Education, each participant who had been issued a Conditional Substitute Teacher License was eligible for assignment to a position as a teacher in the New York City school system. The Board of Education further agreed that this conditional license could be converted, without further fee, to the usual substitute license under the following two conditions:

1. Completion of one year of satisfactory teaching.
2. Completion of the minimum academic and professional requirements for the prescribed substitute license.

The usual college fees and related costs were paid by the Board of Education for all participants who attended the summer program and fall seminar at The City College. The Board of Education made the commitment to offer employment in the New York City schools in September, 1966, for a period of one year and to continue a special orientation and training program during that year. In return, each participant committed himself to accept the assigned position, to serve for the one-year period, and to register for the fall seminar.

Objectives

The objectives of the program were:

1. To aid in the recruitment of up to 3,000 more teachers than could be recruited by ordinary procedures. These teachers were necessary to a program of improved educational services to be conducted by the New York City Board of Education for disadvantaged children in the city's public and non-public schools.
2. To screen and select participants for the pre-service summer college program of professional courses, the conditional substitute license, the in-service fall semester college program and the on-the-job training program.
3. To develop screening and selection materials and procedures to enroll participants in any future programs of similar nature.
4. To develop materials and procedures for on-the-job orientation, training, and support of beginning teachers in programs of education of children from disadvantaged backgrounds.
5. To provide the selection program, the college training program, and on-the-job follow-up program in college courses and in-school supervision and support.

The objectives of the evaluation were:

1. To add to our knowledge concerning the recruitment and selection of teachers in an urban setting, needed preparation for a beginning teaching position and in-service growth of new teachers.
2. To explore factors that might influence the effectiveness of beginning teachers.

3. To determine the degree to which the abbreviated pre-service program plus on-the-job teaching experience and supervision qualified the participants to carry out a responsible teaching assignment.
4. To contribute, through the study of the persistence of the participants, to an understanding of factors associated with turnover in the teacher profession.

According to the terms of the contract between The City University of New York and the Board of Education, a preliminary report was submitted in January, 1967.[1] This report gave statistics on such characteristics of the trainees as their geographical distribution, age, sex, time since receiving baccalaureate degree, previous employment, and other personal characteristics. It also gave data on attrition, grade distribution in summer courses, and teaching appointments. That preliminary report was necessarily descriptive and non-evaluative. The data set forth in that report are also included in this final report, making it unnecessary for the reader to receive the preliminary report.

Nature of the Program

Participants for the program were recruited, interviewed, screened, selected and examined for conditional licenses in May and June of 1966. The number of applicants admitted to any field depended upon the need for teachers in the New York City public schools. The nature and quality of the applicant's undergraduate record was taken into account in the assignment of priorities.

During the summer, the elementary education program (common branches) extended over seven weeks (July 11 to August 26) and carried eight undergraduate credits. These courses were organized around a focus on problems and procedures in urban schools and included the following courses of study:

1. Child development and learning in the urban setting.
2. Program, curriculum, and teaching in the elementary school.
3. Methods of teaching with emphasis on reading and related language arts.

---

[1] Harris, Albert J., Lohman, Maurice A., et al. A Preliminary Report on the Intensive Teacher Training Program, The City College of New York, Summer and Fall, 1966-1967, The Office of Research and Evaluation, The Division of Teacher Education, The City University of New York, New York: January 1967.

The secondary education program extended over six weeks (July 18 to August 26) and carried six undergraduate credits. These courses were organized around a focus on problems and procedures in urban schools and included the following courses of study:

1. Adolescent development and learning in the urban setting.
2. General program and methods in the secondary school.
3. Special curriculum and teaching of the subject in which the teacher was to be assigned.

The fall program consisted of a two-credit graduate level seminar entitled "Problems of Teaching in the Elementary (or Secondary) School," taken while the participants carried full-time teaching assignments. The elementary school seminar was designed to integrate the current experiences and problems of the beginning teacher with further study of the design and development of curriculum in relation to children's needs and achievements, classroom instruction, insight into the meaning of individual and group behavior, and learning outcomes. The secondary school seminar included case analysis by the group along with lectures by special lecturers and consultants.

The fall course was accompanied by an organized on-the-job orientation prepared by the New York City Board of Education, along with after-school workshops. A committee of the Board of Education prepared three manuals to help give special and detailed assistance to new elementary and secondary teachers and to establish some basic guidelines for their supervisors. A manual was also prepared for use in the after-school workshops.

Selection Procedures

The Board of Education conducted a massive recruitment advertising campaign in the spring of 1966. A sum of $25,000 was spent on radio, television, and newspaper announcements. Due to the campaign, over 20,000 inquiries were received.

Applications were filed between May 5, 1966 and June 30, 1966 at the offices of the Board of Examiners along with a $3.00 fee. The fee was returned if the applicant was not accepted by The City College. Copies of the application forms are included in Appendix A.

Each applicant was required to submit evidence of the receipt of the baccalaureate degree. There were no age requirements; however, a regular substitute license lapses at the end of the school term in which the holder reaches the age of 70 years. An applicant was required to be a citizen of the United States or a legal declarant of his intentions to become a citizen of the United States.

Each applicant was required to successfully pass the following examinations:

1. A test in written English, in which an essay written by the applicant was rated for written English only.
2. An interview test to evaluate the applicant's ability to discuss problems relating to his subject or to the teaching of his subject; those aspects of personality as to which an interview afforded a basis of judgment; the applicant's oral reading ability; and his use of English in discussions.
3. An appraisal of his scholastic record.
4. A physical and medical test.

A great effort was made to qualify all trainees before they were accepted. This was accomplished in almost all cases. Unfortunately, there were a few cases where candidates were notified of failure after completion of the training period.

Each applicant signed a Statement of Commitment agreeing to accept an assignment to a full-time, per annum substitute position in the New York City public school system for the school year beginning September 6, 1966 and ending June 30, 1967. They further agreed to take the two-credit seminar at The City College School of Education during the Fall 1966 semester.

Those applicants who applied for positions in which the quota was filled were asked to register for a different position or were not admitted to the program. In these cases, the college transcript was used to judge adequacy of subject-matter background.

Many personal interviews were conducted by the Board of Education personnel to encourage those applicants for overly subscribed positions to accept other positions for which they were qualified. They were consequently successful in diverting a much larger number of men into the elementary education field than normally would have been expected.

The Instructors

The project administrative staff consisted of a director, an assistant director, an elementary coordinator, a secondary coordinator and six administrative assistants.

The faculty consisted of 70 elementary instructors and 54 secondary instructors. Recommendations of possible faculty members were sought from the following sources:

1. All district superintendents, assistant superintendents, and other key personnel in the New York City school system.
2. Key personnel at the Board of Education headquarters.
3. Heads of schools and departments of education at local universities.
4. The administration of the teacher education program at The City College who were asked to review recent staff applications.
5. City College staff who rated names on lists of school psychologists provided by their professional associations.

These lists were then circulated among various consultants, who checked those whom they knew to be outstanding or promising in their fields. Tabulations were made of the various recommendations. The lists and the recommendations were examined by a committee of The City College faculty, together with the two coordinators. Additional information was collected in certain cases. Some candidates were called for interviews at the College. It was not possible to interview each candidate; however, in the case of the psychology instructors, nearly all of the candidates were interviewed by a committee from the Department of Social and Psychological Foundations of Education.

Table 1 presents a distribution of the occupations of the 124 instructors chosen for the program. Of the total group, 83 or 67 per cent were either principals, assistant principals or department chairmen in New York City public schools. The 11 classroom teachers had an average of 10 years of teaching experience.

Table 1

Occupation of Instructors

Occupation	Elementary	Secondary	Total
School Principal	25	12	37
Assistant Principal	20	2	22
Department Chairman	-	24	24
Guidance Director	4	1	5
Teacher	5	6	11
Graduate Student	1	-	1
College Professor	4	-	4
School Psychologist	11	4	15
Clinical Psychologist	-	4	4
Social Worker	-	1	1
Total	70	54	124

All but nine per cent of the instructors held degrees above the baccalaureate level. Seventeen held doctorates and six held professional certificates in their fields. Table 2 presents a distribution of the highest earned degree.

Table 2

Highest Earned Degree of Instructors

Degree	Elementary	Secondary	Total
B.A. or B.S.	5	6	11
M.A. or M.S.	53	37	90
Professional Certificates	4	2	6
Ed.D. or Ph.D.	8	9	17
Total	70	54	124

Evaluation Procedures

The project was evaluated by the Office of Research and Evaluation of the Division of Teacher Education of The City University. The evaluation proceeded in two phases:

1. Evaluation of procedures and results in the period May 1, 1966 through August 31, 1966, covering recruitment, selection, course development, results in training, and retention in training.
2. Evaluation of procedures and results in the school year beginning September, 1966, covering in-service program, special program of supervision and supportive services, retention in service, growth in service, and principal's evaluations of teaching competence

Phase 1 Instruments

During the second week of the program, the following instruments were administered to all students in the program:

1. Inventory I, a collection of 21 items of personal demographic information, educational and experience records. These items reinforced the information requested in the original application form. (Apendix B)
2. Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, an inventory designed to measure those attitudes of a teacher which are related to his ability to establish and maintain rapport with pupils. It consisted of 150 opinion statements, to each of which the respondent indicated the extent of his agreement or disagreement on a five-step scale.

   The concurrent validity of this inventory has been well documented in many studies. The instrument has been shown to discriminate reliably among groups of teachers at various levels of training and experience.

In the final week of the summer program, the following data were collected and instruments administered:

1. Course grades were recorded for each student in the program as assigned by the instructors. Both individual course grades and grade point averages were recorded.

2. Instructors' Evaluation of Course was an inventory which elicited demographic information about the instructors and their opinions of the course for which they were responsible. The questionnaire requested information about the instructor, the students, the facilities, the materials, and the curriculum, as well as recommendations for improvement. (Appendix B)

3. A drop-out questionnaire entitled, "Questionnaire for Teachers Who Have Discontinued Service in New York City Schools," was an instrument requesting reasons for withdrawal from the program, which was sent to each student who left the program at the time of withdrawal. (Appendix B)

Phase 2 Instruments

At the beginning of the fall semester, each student in the seminar course filled out the following:

1. Assignment card furnished name of school, grade assignment, and name of supervisor.
2. Registration card furnished name of center where fall course is being taken and list of any other courses taken by the student.

At the end of the fall semester, the following data were collected and instruments administered:

1. Course grades were recorded for each student in the program. New grade-point averages were derived and recorded, combining summer and fall grades.
2. Principal's ratings were collected for each student and recorded.
3. Inventory IV consisted of 28 multiple-choice statements designed to sample opinions about beginning teaching experience. Each of the 28 items contained three choices, one of which indicated satisfaction with beginning teaching. In addition, the inventory contained 11 aspects of the beginning teacher's work for which the student was asked to rate his satisfaction on a four-point scale. (Appendix B)

Procedures

Records were kept of the following:

1. **recruitment procedures and outcomes**
2. **screening instruments, procedures, and mortality in terms of elimination of applicants**
3. **personal data about students**
4. **holding power of the summer and fall programs**
5. **content of courses, curricula, and materials used**
6. **reactions of students and faculty in the summer and fall programs of professional courses**
7. **placement procedures and instruments**
8. **the developed follow-up supervisory and supportive program materials, procedures, and effect on performance and retention of new teachers**
9. **materials and methods in the fall seminars**
10. **extent to which the project met the need for new teachers in the emerging programs for better education for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds.**
11. **principals' and supervisors' ratings of ITTP teachers.**

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON EXPERIMENTAL TEACHER-EDUCATION PROGRAMS

This chapter provides a summary of the research available on teacher education programs which, like ITTP, depart from the usual combination of undergraduate and graduate work in education and are designed for college graduates with little or no previous training for teaching. It may, therefore, be skipped by readers who desire to find out the results of the present study as quickly as possible.

Since the turn of the century there has been a variety of calls either to supplement or to deviate from the usual four-year undergraduate plus one-year graduate teacher education sequence.

The major purpose of such deviational teacher-education programs has been to counteract the teacher shortage that has been a continuing problem since World War II. In addition, in the very recent past particular developments have arisen which also require more rapid methods of producing teachers. A major development is the widespread recognition that specialized training is necessary for those teachers who will work with the large proportion of our student population that is considered culturally disadvantaged. Another development has been the introduction of the Peace Corps, which has provided a number of resourceful young adults with experience in teaching, an experience many of them would like to continue in their home states but which they can not because they lack state certification requirements.

As early as 1895, Brown University initiated a fifth-year internship program, the basic idea of which continued throughout the 1930's. This kind of internship was a program of practice teaching at the graduate level after undergraduate courses in professional education. These early programs had as their goal the tightening up of admissions standards for future teachers and the better preparation of those who had been selected (13).

After World War II when the situation changed from teacher oversupply to severe shortage, the fifth-year program movement became primarily a means of dealing with the problem of inadequate teacher supply. Instead of being a means for restricting the number of teachers entering the field, it became a major means for increasing the supply (13). In 1948, the New York State Department of Education initiated an Intensive Teacher Training Program which was offered

by 10 state teachers' colleges to recruit liberal arts graduates into the teaching profession. Beginning about 1951, the development of experimental fifth-year programs was stimulated by the financial support of foundations, notably the Fund for the Advancement of Education and the Carnegie Corporation (14). Consequently, present-day internship programs are basically of two types: the original kind that offers additional professional work to graduates of teacher-education programs and the newer ones that offer intensive professional training to liberal arts graduates. It is the latter type that concerns us here. Spurred mainly by the particular interest of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, the importance of these new programs by the 1950's was seen to be more than their potential for increasing teacher supply. They were regarded as possible means for testing the hypothesis that perhaps such programs were actually an approach to training teachers superior to the traditional undergraduate teacher-education programs.

In current usage, an internship program of the type we are concerned with is one that is offered to college graduates who specialized in a field other than education, who will begin the study of education on an advanced level, who will be responsible for the instruction of students as part of their preparation, and who will be supervised by college and public school personnel (7).

Shaplin and Powell (13) described the two basic types of internship program for liberal arts graduates:

1. the certification pattern in certain states which already require five years of preparation, and
2. the master's degree program in the fifth year, often called the Master of Arts in Teaching.

Two principal variations of the certification type of internship are represented by the California and New York patterns. In both types of program, the intern serves as a regular teacher for a full year at full pay. Prior to the program, he enrolls in a special summer program including curriculum and methodology. During the internship he is supervised by both the school and college staffs and participates in a seminar at the college dealing with problems arising in teaching. Interns take additional course work in the summer following their year of teaching. Credits accumulated in the program count toward a future master's degree.

The differences in the two patterns are as follows:

1. Student teaching is included in the pre-service summer program in California, while the New York State pattern programs have observations in public schools but not practice teaching.
2. Under the California pattern, interns serve under a pilot program credential which is not renewable. The course work taken the summer after their teaching year is to complete requirements for the general state teaching credential.

Under the New York State pattern, the intern earns a Provisional State Certificate from his pre-service summer program which is good for five years and may be converted to a permanent certificate during that time by completing 30 course credits and two years of successful teaching.

In 1960 there were 25 programs in California covering elementary, secondary, and junior college levels. Variations of the New York State program for secondary level teachers were offered at Albany, Colgate, Fordham, Hofstra, New York University, St. Bonaventure, St. John's, and Yeshiva. At the elementary level, programs were offered at state colleges at Brockport, Buffalo, Cortland, Fredonia, Genesee, New Paltz, Oneonta, Oswego, Plattsburg, and Potsdam, and at Adelphi, College of Saint Rose, Syracuse, and Wagner (13).

The emergency or intensive programs that were developed by the state teachers' colleges in Connecticut and Massachusetts during the late 1940's and early 1950's were similar to the above arrangements. A special variation of this type of program, lasting three years and terminating in a master's degree, has been in effect for some years at Temple University. The orientation here seems to be that adequate professional preparation cannot be provided in one graduate year; that for carefully selected liberal arts graduates the best professional orientation to teaching consists of expert guidance in the solution of problems as they arise in the teaching situation.

Master's degree internships emphasize completion of degree requirements rather than obtaining certification. There are two major variations differing in duration of internship:

1. Those that involve a preparatory summer and one academic year, one semester of which is spent in full-time teaching under supervision.

In such a program two interns share the load of a beginning teacher. (Brown, Colgate, Harvard, Goucher, Johns Hopkins, Notre Dame, Vanderbilt, Oberlin.)

2. Those that involve two summers and one school year of part-time teaching concurrent with seminars, course work, and supervision. (Converse, North Carolina, Northwestern, Pittsburgh, and Stanford.)

Some programs stress the scholarly role of the teacher and require substantially more graduate work in the subject fields than other programs. At Duke and Maine the intern spends full time in the school for a year. At Chicago, Wesleyan, and University of Southern California, the program is for a two-year period.

Recently there has been widespread recognition of the need for reforms in the entire educational system in order to provide effective instruction for the large percentage of our population which is considered culturally disadvantaged. Changes in teacher education are crucial in these attempts at reform, and some programs have recruited liberal arts graduates for specialized training.

One of many such programs is Project Beacon offered by Yeshiva University in New York City (19). The assumptions underlying this program are that negative influences in the school itself, in addition to the home and community, may contribute substantially to impede normative performance of deprived children; that appropriate curricular experiences can minimize, if not fully overcome, the academic and related handicaps common among these children; that teachers need special theoretical insights, attitudes, and classroom skills relevant to the special learning problems involved; and that liberal arts graduates with good academic records and who evidence genuine interest in depressed area schools are generally good prospects for participation in programs for disadvantaged children.

Liberal arts graduates are admitted to the project on the basis of scores on the Graduate Record Examination and the results of a personal interview. The project is open only to full-time resident students who, upon completion of the program, will obtain New York State certification as an elementary school teacher and a Master's Degree in Education. The duration of the program is two summers and the intervening academic year. Students act as interns in public schools serving disadvantaged areas and in group work and case work agencies in these neighborhoods. Discussion and evaluation of these experiences are the focus of the accompanying internship seminars. Provision is made for the interns to have direct observations and special field trips in contrasting schools and neighborhoods so that they can more appropriately evaluate their field experience. Special workshops, such as remediation practices, are included in the internship seminars.

A distinguishing characteristic of this program is its affiliation with a community action organization, Mobilization for Youth. This organization provides scholarships for the interns, who, in return, work in MFY programs or schools in the area it serves.

Project TIE (Teacher-Intern-Education) (5), sponsored by The Coordinating Council on Education for the Disadvantaged, also has as its purpose the training of teachers from liberal arts backgrounds to serve culturally disadvantaged children. A distinguishing feature of this program is the recruitment of liberal arts graduates of ability but who are from lower economic strata and would require subsidization to continue their studies on the graduate level. This program, then, aims to serve two groups: primarily, the disadvantaged children who should be benefiting from instruction by specially trained teachers, and in addition, the teachers themselves who might otherwise have gone into the business world because of higher salaries and might have constituted a group of "drop-outs" from the field of education.

Interns are assigned to work and study full-time at half-salary in selected public elementary, special service, and high schools in distressed areas of New York City. They provide individual and small group remedial and tutorial instruction and increased counseling of parents and children. They are under supervision of principals, department heads, faculties of colleges, and the director of TIE. At the end of the one-year program, interns receive full master's credit.

Brooklyn College of The City University of New York has instituted a "Program for the Preparation of College Graduates for Teaching in Urban Elementary Schools in Economically Disadvantaged Areas" (3). This is a 48-credit program leading to the degree of Master of Science in Education, which is designed to prepare candidates for meeting provisional and permanent state certification requirements and New York City licensing requirements.

The National Teacher Corps, funded under Title V, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has as its goal the recruitment of teachers for slum schools. The aim here is to supplement rather than to replace regular school staff.

Interns have college degrees but are inexperienced in teaching. They enroll in a special two- or three-month pre-service training program at a college to study sociology of urban and rural poverty, become acquainted with attitudes and behavior patterns of the disadvantaged and obtain academic and practical knowledge needed to teach the disadvantaged. Interns will teach part-time, as part of a team with a master teacher, work in school-related and community projects, and study for an advanced degree at a nearby college or university (4).

The first of the N.T.C. training programs was held in the summer of 1966. Forty-one institutions in 26 states participated (4). One of these summer programs was offered by Hunter College (15). This particular National Teacher Corps Project emphasized "supervised immersion of the intern in the community itself" from the beginning of training. Interns were involved in the atmosphere of Harlem (visiting agencies such as The Urban League, Psychiatric Clinic of Harlem Hospital and working in community agencies), in the problems of children and families, and in current activities aimed at solution of current problems.

Following the lead of the Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching (18), more than 200 intern programs are being established across the country to facilitate the certification of returned Peace Corpsmen.

Cardozo High School located in a slum area of Washington, D. C., recognized and attempted to forestall the possibility that if the Peace Corps volunteers were made to meet innumerable certification requirements before being allowed to teach, they might lose the special enthusiasm they had gained from their teaching assignments abroad. Their answer to the problem was the Cardozo intern program, whereby the school uses the special ability of former volunteers who stay in the profession. The interns teach and work toward certification at the same time.

The development of teacher-training programs for liberal arts graduates has gotten off to a strong start in a short period of time. One 1966 listing of colleges, in New York State alone, that offer a post-graduate program leading to teacher certification for people who have had little or no undergraduate teacher training includes 38 institutions (16). It is highly likely that the near future of teacher-education training will evidence an even greater number of such programs and further specializations within them.

Although various internships and specialized teacher-education programs have been going on for years and opinions for or against them have been heard, not much has been done in the way of actual evaluation of the effectiveness of the products of these programs.

One major study was published in 1950 by Beecher, evaluating the results of the Intensive Training Program initiated in 1948 by the New York State Department of Education (1). Twelve experienced supervisors from the 10 New York State teachers' colleges offering the program evaluated the teaching effectiveness of provisionally certified and regularly certified first-year elementary school teachers by two rating scales ("The Summary of Teaching Service," devised for the study and the standardized "Scale for Rating Effective Teacher Behavior") and an overall impression.

Regular teachers were rated higher on all three criteria in both the fall and spring evaluations. No tests of significance were reported, however. Improvement during the year was evident for both groups. Trainees showed greater degree of improvement than the regular teachers, but they did not, on the average, reach the performance level of the regularly trained group. The difference between the groups diminished from 15 to 9 points during the period between evaluations. When asked whether any of the teachers should discontinue, supervisors recommended this action for nine per cent of the trainees and 11 per cent of the regulars; thus, evaluation of "complete failures" was almost the same in both groups.

Beecher considered the emergency program a success both with respect to the quality of teaching service rendered and the substantial numbers of additional teachers recruited (an increase of more than 40 per cent for the teacher supply). By the end of the first year of teaching, the percentage of trainees rendering average or better service was only slightly less than that expected from beginning teachers with regular four-year training. Eighty-six per cent of the trainees were reemployed for a second academic year, 72 per cent of this group being reemployed in the same school districts.

In regard to Beecher's study, it is important to note that although the original aim of the emergency program was to recruit graduates of liberal arts colleges who had no previous preparation for teaching, only 16 per cent of the actual group of trainees had less than six-semester hours' credit in education courses.

Although this particular study was not meant to be comparative, Halliwell's (9) point is well taken that in order to ascertain the efficacy of these two methods of teacher training, it would be important to note whether the trend of diminishing differences between the two groups over time would continue over extended time periods and see whether this phenomenon is the result of experience or of further education courses.

Halliwell (9) reviewed other studies in the area of evaluating the teaching effectiveness of interns as compared with regularly trained beginning teachers. George Magrath (12) emphasized the need for evaluation in Connecticut by citing the fact that in 1957-58, 43 per cent of the new elementary school teachers in that state were trained in experimental programs, and there was no formal evidence to attest to their effectiveness. Their criterion of teacher effectiveness was one of Beecher's rating scales, the Teacher Evaluation Record, on which teachers were scored by their principals. Regular teachers scored higher than experimental teachers in each of the first three years of teaching. The differences, however, were not significant. Halliwell criticized Magrath's study for not considering the interactive effects of age, sex, grade level, and previous courses. He also challenged the use of a t-test for determining significance of difference between ratings of the two groups of teachers, since he did not report how closely the principals' ratings approximated a normal distribution. Here, too, as in Beecher's study, we did not have a pure experimental group; less than one-fifth of the group had no prior courses in educational psychology.

In another unpublished doctoral dissertation, Steven Gittler (6) found that his measures of professional characteristics (the MTAI and an adaptation of Rosner's Check List of Professional Teacher Behavior), rated by principals, did not discriminate between regular and experimental elementary school teachers. Nondiscriminability between the two groups was maintained when they were divided into subsamples based on sex, age, and experience.

Lupone (11) was concerned with a problem that can arise in these studies --the frame of reference of the principal who is doing the rating of teachers. (The principal in a slum area may be comparing his new teacher with his staff of apathetic teachers; the principal in a desirable suburban area may be comparing his new teacher with his experienced staff of high quality teachers.) Lupone had each principal rate both an experimental and a regular teacher. He also divided the principals into dichotomous subgroups based on principals' experience (more or less than seven years) and the size of the community (more or less than 5,000 population).

The principals rated the experimental teachers significantly superior, at the .01 level, to the regular teachers on five of the seven dimensions in the rating scale. These five dimensions were: planning, preparation and management, subject matter presentation, instructional skill, pupil-teacher rapport, and pupil evaluation. The two groups of teachers did not differ significantly on the dimensions of human relations and parent-teacher relations.

Although Lupone's study covered three academic years, the same teachers were not followed through that period so that no attempt was made to see changes in the differences in ratings over time. Halliwell presented a reanalysis of Lupone's data classified with respect to years of teaching. In the first year and the second year, the regular teachers were found to be significantly superior to the experimental teachers (especially in areas of instruction, preparation, planning, and management). In the third year, every difference between experimental and regular teachers favored the regular teachers, but not one of these differences was significant.

Beery (2) divided his experimental group into those with one or more education courses and those with no education courses. This experimental group had no summer training session. His criteria of teaching effectiveness were the Classroom Observation Record, Scale for Appropriate Teaching Techniques, and an overall summary judgment. The raters were two professional educators, two persons outside the professional field and a former superintendent of schools. Regular teachers received higher ratings on all criterion measures of effectiveness than the experimental group. Every mean difference between regular teachers and experimental teachers with some education courses was significant. Mean differences between regular teachers and experimental teachers with no professional preparation were significant on the overall summary judgment and on one rating dimension (stimulating, imaginative or enthusiastic vs. dull, routine teacher behavior). The differences found here between the experimental and regular teachers diminished between the fall and spring observations. Beery concluded from his study that the professional sequence in education courses is reflected in more effective teaching. His study rases again the question as to whether teaching experience brings the provisionaly certified teacher up to the level of the fully certified teacher.

Of the five studies cited in this area, four report that regular teachers score higher than trainees on at least some of their measures of effectiveness, some of the differences being significant, others not. One study used measures which did not discriminate between the two groups of teachers. Halliwell summarized the research studies of effectiveness of interns by emphasizing their meager number, the general lack of sophistication in design, absence of longitudinal designs which leaves unanswered the important question of chages in effectiveness over time, and generally not taking into account personal factors of the teachers.

A study that did emphasize personal characteristics of interns was done by Haberman (8) in his evaluation of the 1962-63 Intern Teaching Program at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

The group of interns ranged in age from 23 to 53. They were selected on the basis of grade-point average, Miller Analogies Test, MTAI, The Cooperative English Test, and a personal interview from which an attempt was made to evaluate their teaching potential. The comparison group of regular first-year teachers were in their early 20's and were in the top half of the undergraduate class elementary education majors (based on grade-point average, predictive ratings of college supervisor, and scores on the College Qualifications Test). These people, therefore, were considered to have had better-than-average potential for teaching.

A higher proportion of interns than of regular teachers had scores above the median for all three teacher-behavior patterns in Ryan's Classroom Observation Record. For Pattern X (kindly, friendly, understanding v. aloof, egocentric, restricted) and Pattern Z (stimulating, imaginative, surgent, vs. dull, routine) the differences could have been due to chance. For Pattern Y (responsible, systematic, businesslike vs. evading, unplanned, slipshod), there was a significantly higher proportion of interns than of regular teachers who scored above the median.

Haberman suggested reasons other than better preparation of interns to explain their higher Y scores. Interns surpassed the regular teachers in work experience, most having had full-time jobs as compared with the summer and after-school jobs of the regular teachers. Interns were seen as having had generally broader life experiences, and more of them had responsible roles (as spouse or parent). Interns were thought of as possibly more highly motivated for success than regular teachers in response to the incentive of family responsibility and for taking action that is not generally encouraged in our society--changing career during mature years.

Haberman offered as additional support for his hypotheses the observation that the interns who received the lowest observers' ratings were three of the four young single girls in the group. Interns who indicated least promise, then, were most like the regular teachers in terms of age, sex, marital status, work experience, life experience, grade-point average, and prediction of college faculty regarding potential for success in teaching.

Haberman's suggestion for future comparison studies of interns and regular teachers was that more emphasis should be placed on the characteristics and attributes of the individuals selected for the internship programs than on differences in preparation of the programs.

To the present time, at least, research studies have not contributed much either to support or to counteract the continuance of pre-service internship programs. Current opinion, however, seems to be that the traditional four-year plus one sequence will probably retain its position for many years as the major training approach.(10).

Those who argue for the training of teachers within the undergraduate system point to its characteristics of being an unhurried, planned, step-by-step sequence, which permits the college graduate to begin contributing to society sooner and which, followed by several years of experience in teaching, is an assurance of more profitable graduate study in the future. Moreover, they believe it is unreasonable to expect many prospective teachers, particularly women whose teaching careers may be short, to undertake the financial investment of the fifth year of study. In addition, not all prospective teachers are able to profit from graduate study (10).

Speaking more specifically against the intern approach rather than just for the undergraduate method, critics tend to see the intern experiences as "lumped on" (7) rather than integrated with the students' liberal education. They consider the condensed period of training insufficient time for the interns to be changed in important ways. Moreover, of necessity, intern programs must concentrate on survival techniques for inexperienced beginners rather than on the fundamental knowledge which is basic to the development of professional educators. The possibility that inexperienced interns might harm their students is seen as a real danger.

The continuance of internship programs seems extremely likely (as long as no definite negative findings are established regarding the products of these programs) because it provides an excellent entrance into the field of education for a number of groups of people: 1) those who can afford to forestall a career choice--undergraduates who desire and can afford a full four-year liberal arts education, unrestricted by the demands of professional education, 2) qualified students who have had difficulty making a career choice when it was required of them--undergraduates who delay making vocational choices, many of whom are overwhelmed by the variety of opportunities for which they qualify, until their senior year or even later, 3) those who see the necessity for reversing an unfortunate career choice--undergraduates who prepare for professions, during the course of which they recognize that they are not interested in that profession or are not temperamentally suited to it, 4) those recent and mature graduates who desire to change fields after graduation (10).

Beside the personal significance of the intern programs for the above groups, these programs have commanded considerable support. Advocates of the programs emphasize the high academic and personal standards usually required for admission, the elimination of inappropriate or repetitious professional courses, increased cooperation of public schools and universitiesin the preparation of teachers, the possibility for strong interrelationship between theory and practice, and the potential for new knowledge gained from the experimental designs of the programs (7).

John Whitelaw (17), besides seeing positive results of pre-service programs, emphasized the utilization of these results to improve the overall quality in future teacher-education programs. He predicted that by 1970 at least 35 states will require four years of higher education plus an additional year to be completed within a stipulated period for full teaching certification. He proposed the replacement of current practice teaching by paid internships. A paid internship was considered superior for two reasons: 1) it provides the student with practical experience at a level of professional responsibility higher than that possible in most student teaching programs, and 2) it achieves strong relationship between the teacher-training institution and a cooperating public school system. It may be possible to spread the generally good quality of supervision of interns by recognition of master teachers in terms of professional status and increased salary. He believes that the major contributions of the fifth-year pre-service programs have already been made. The task for the decade ahead is to simplify and clarify the results of the numerous programs and to work toward utilizing the outcomes of these programs.

References

1. Beecher, Dwight E. The Intensive Teacher Training Program: An Evaluation of Results. Albany: Division of Research, New York State Dept. of Education, 1950, 42 pp.

2. Beery, John R. Professional Preparation and Effectiveness of Beginning Teachers, Miami Graphic Arts Press, University of Miami, 1960, 84 pp.

3. Brooklyn College Bulletin, Division of Graduate Studies, 1966-67.

4. Clearinghouse on Urban Teacher Education Report, Vol. No. 2, Summer 1966.

5. Coordinating Council on Education for the Disadvantaged, Project TIE (Teacher-Intern-Education), mimeographed paper.

6. Gittler, Steven. Profesional characteristics of Elementary School Teachers from an ITTP and a Bachelor's Degree Program. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Buffalo, New York: University of Buffalo, 1961.

7. Haberman, M. The Teacher Behavior of Successful Interns, Journal of Teacher Education, June 1965, 16, 2, 215-220.

8. Haberman, M. A Comparison of Interns with Regular First Year Teachers, Journal of Educational Research, Oct. 1965, 59, 92-94.

9. Halliwell, J. W. A Review of the Research Comparing the Teaching Effectiveness of Elementary School Teachers Prepared in Intensive Teacher Training Programs and in Regular Undergraduate Programs, Journal of Teacher Education, June 1964, 15, 184-192.

10. Herzog, J. D. Preparing College Graduates to Teach in Schools, Preliminary Edition. American Council on Education, 1960.

11. Lupone, Orlando J. A Comparison of Provisionally Certified and Permanently Certified Elementary School Teachers in Selected School Districts in New York State, Journal of Educational Research, Oct. 1961, 55, 53-63.

12. Magrath, George. An Evaluation of Teachers Trained under the Intensive Program for College Graduates. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Storrs, Connecticut: University of Connecticut, 1960.

13. Shaplin, J. T., and Powell, A. G. A Comparison of Internship Programs, Journal of Teacher Education, June 1964, 15, 175-183.

14. Stinnett, T. M., and Clarke, C. M. Teacher Education: Programs, *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 3rd Edition. (Edited by W. S. Monroe.) New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

15. Tanzer, C., and Kravetz, N. *Director's Final Report, National Teacher Corps*, Hunter College Project, Summer 1966. Mimeographed paper.

16. *Teacher Education Programs and Certification Policies*. The University of the State of New York. The State Education and Certification Department, Albany, New York.

17. Whitelaw, J. B. Teacher Preparation: Five Targets for the Next Ten Years, *School Life*, Jan-Feb. 1964, *45*, 11-12.

18. Wiggins, W. W. Promises of Home: Returned Peace Corps Volunteers. *American Education*, April 1965, *1*, 21-25.

19. Yeshiva University, Graduate School of Education. *Training of Teachers of Disadvantaged Children: Training Programs in Project Beacon*. Jan. 1963. Mimeographed paper.

CHAPTER III

THE TRAINEES

Characteristics of the Group

Enrollment

The New York City Board of Education, as a result of intensive publicity, received over 20,000 inquiries prior to the beginning of the program. Forty-five hundred applications were received from which 3,400 candidates who met the Board's requirements were approved and notified of City College acceptance. Of the 3,400 accepted, 2,110 candidates actually registered for the summer program. Some candidates had applied for and were accepted in more than one section of the program and had to make a choice of section at the time of registration. Of the 2,110 who registered for the program, 1,858 or 88 per cent successfully completed the summer course of study. Attendance in the fall course numbered 1,629. One hundred seventy-nine of those who successfully completed the summer program did not register for the fall course and 50 registered for the fall course but did not attend.[1] A total of 1,492 passed the fall course, while 137 failed. The ITTP enrollment statistics are summarized in Table 3.

Sex

In the total program 57 per cent of the trainees were male and 43 per cent female. Of the elementary students, 53 per cent were male and 47 per cent were female. Of the secondary students, 72 per cent were male and 28 per cent were female. Table 4 presents a summary of the sex of the trainees. The large percentage of men in the Elementary Program was related to the fact that many men were encouraged to transfer to that program when the Secondary quota had been filled.

Age

Although the age range of the trainees was from below 25 to above 60, 53 per cent of the total group were under 25. Sixty-four per cent of the men and 38 per cent of the women were under 25, and another 13 per cent of both sexes were between 25 and 29. Only 14 per cent of the total group were 45 years or

---

[1] Additional information obtained since the Preliminary Report was written has resulted in minor changes in some of the statistics contained in that report.

Table 3

Enrollment Statistics

	Elementary	Secondary	Total
Inquiries (at Board of Education)	-	-	20,000+
Applications filed	2,000	2,500	4,500
Candidates notified of City College acceptance	1,950[a]	1,450	3,400
Registrants in summer course	1,295	815	2,110
Drop-outs in summer	64	41	105
Failed summer course	100	53	153
Completed summer course	1,127	731	1,858
Registered for fall course	1,037	642	1,679
Did not register for fall course	90	89	179
Registered for fall course, but did not attend	35	15	50
Attended fall course	1,002	627	1,629
Passed fall course	915	577	1,492
Failed fall course	87	50	137

[a] Includes a substantial number of transfers from among those who originally applied in secondary education (especially in Social Studies and English), but transferred to elementary education because the secondary quota was filled.

Table 4

Sex of Trainees

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	518	53	516	72	1,034	57
Female	584	47	205	28	789	43

N = 1,823

older. In general, the secondary group tended to be somewhat younger than the elementary group. Tables 5, 6, and 7 present a summary of the age of trainees by sex and school level.

Table 5

Age of Trainees for Total Group

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 25	666	64	299	38	965	53
25 - 29	132	13	100	13	232	13
30 - 34	44	4	64	8	108	5
35 - 39	51	5	85	10	136	7
40 - 44	47	4	99	12	146	8
45 - 49	43	4	77	10	120	7
50 - 54	26	3	45	6	71	4
55 - 59	19	2	14	2	33	2
60+	6	1	6	1	12	1

N = 1,823

Table 6

Age of Elementary Trainees

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 25	318	61	208	36	526	48
25 - 29	63	12	57	10	120	11
30 - 34	31	6	50	9	81	7
35 - 39	35	7	72	12	107	10
40 - 44	19	4	86	14	105	9
45 - 49	27	5	60	10	87	7
50 - 54	15	3	35	6	50	5
55 - 59	8	2	10	2	18	2
60+	2	0	6	1	8	1

N = 1,102

Table 7

Age of Secondary Trainees

Age	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 25	348	67	91	44	439	60
25 - 29	69	14	43	22	112	15
30 - 34	13	3	14	7	27	4
35 - 39	16	3	13	6	29	4
40 - 44	28	5	13	6	41	6
45 - 49	16	3	17	8	33	5
50 - 54	11	2	10	5	21	3
55 - 59	11	2	4	2	15	2
60+	4	1	0	0	4	1

N = 721

Year of Baccalaureate Degree

Fifty-two per cent of the males and 31 per cent of the females received their baccalaureate degrees in the month immediately preceding the program. Sixty-seven per cent of the total group had received their B.A. degrees within the past five years. An additional six per cent had been enrolled in graduate programs other than teacher education immediately prior to the program; most of these were law students. Tables 8, 9, and 10 present the distribution of the year of baccalaureate degree.

Geographical Distribution of Trainees

Seventy-one per cent of the trainees were born in New York City and 81 per cent were living in the city immediately prior to the program. Although the program received nation-wide publicity, only eight per cent of the trainees came from outside of New York State. Southern states accounted for one per cent of the total group. Table 11 and Table 12 show the place of birth and residence prior to the ITTP program.

Table 8

Year of B.A. Degree for Total Group

Year	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965 - 66	538	52	240	31	778	43
1960 - 64	280	27	164	21	444	24
1955 - 59	57	5	60	8	117	6
1950 - 54	53	5	73	9	126	7
1945 - 49	37	4	90	11	127	7
1940 - 44	23	2	87	11	110	6
1935 - 39	18	2	47	6	65	4
1930 - 34	20	2	22	3	42	2
1925 - 29	7	1	3	0	10	1
1920 - 24	1	0	1	0	2	0

N = 1,821

Table 9

Year of B.A. Degree for Elementary Group

Year	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965 - 66	268	52	169	30	437	40
1960 - 64	124	23	103	18	227	21
1955 - 59	35	7	42	7	77	7
1950 - 54	36	7	56	10	92	8
1945 - 49	19	4	73	12	92	8
1940 - 44	13	3	80	14	93	8
1935 - 39	10	2	37	6	47	4
1930 - 34	10	2	19	3	29	3
1925 - 29	3	0	3	0	6	1
1920 - 24	0	0	1	0	1	0

N = 1,101

Table 10

Year of B.A. Degree for Secondary Group

Year	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1965 - 66	270	53	71	35	341	47
1960 - 64	156	31	61	31	217	30
1955 - 59	22	4	18	9	40	6
1950 - 54	17	3	17	8	34	5
1945 - 49	18	3	17	8	35	5
1940 - 44	10	1	7	3	17	2
1935 - 39	8	2	10	5	18	2
1930 - 34	10	2	3	1	13	2
1925 - 29	4	1	0	0	4	1
1920 - 24	1	0	0	0	1	0

N = 720

Table 11

Place of Birth for Total Group

Place of Birth	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
New York City	824	80	478	61	1,302	71
New York State	35	3	37	5	72	4
Southern U. S.	27	3	69	9	87	5
Other U. S.	111	10	154	20	265	15
Outside U. S.	37	4	48	5	85	5

N = 1,820

The majority of the trainees received their undergraduate training in New York City colleges; 35 per cent in colleges of The City University of New York and 27 per cent in other New York City colleges. Twenty-eight per cent attended schools outside of New York State. Table 13 presents a distribution of college of baccalaureate degree.

Table 12

Residence Prior to ITTP Program

Residence	Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Total N	Total %
New York City	866	85	617	79	1,483	81
New York State	97	9	97	12	194	11
New Jersey	34	3	32	4	66	4
Southern U. S.	5	0	9	1	14	1
Other U. S.	28	3	31	4	59	3

N = 1,816

Table 13

College of B.A. Degree

College	Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Total N	Total %
The City University	340	32	288	36	628	35
City College	170	16	65	8	235	14
Hunter College	25	2	118	15	143	8
Brooklyn College	97	9	72	9	169	9
Queens College	48	5	33	4	81	4
Other Colleges in N. Y. City	348	34	149	19	497	27
Colleges in N. Y. State	102	10	85	11	187	10
Other U. S. Colleges	236	23	252	32	490	27
Colleges Outside U. S.	6	1	14	2	20	1

N = 1,822

Level of Training

Eight per cent of the trainees had been awarded degrees beyond the baccalaureate. Sixty-three per cent had taken no subsequent graduate courses. Tables 14, 15, and 16 report the highest degree earned and Tables 17, 18, and 19 present a distribution of earned graduate credits. It is of interest to note that six per cent of the elementary group had master's degrees in comparison to 11 per cent of the secondary group. One woman held a doctorate from a foreign university. About 15 per cent of the trainees had graduate credit beyond the 30 hours required for the master's degree. Seventy-eight trainees had received the L.L.B. degree in law prior to entering the program.

Table 14

Highest Earned Degree for Total Group

Degree	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's	937	91	738	94	1,675	92
Master's	97	9	49	6	146	8
Doctorate	0	0	1	0	1	0

N = 1,822

Table 15

Highest Earned Degree for Elementary Group

Degree	Male		Female		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Bachelor's	478	92	558	96	1,036	94
Master's	40	8	24	4	64	6
Doctorate	0	0	1	0	1	0

N = 1,101

Table 16

Highest Earned Degree for Secondary Group

Degree	Male N	Male %	Female N	Female %	Total N	Total %
Bachelor's	459	89	180	88	639	89
Master's	57	11	25	12	82	11
Doctorate	0	0	0	0	0	0

N = 721

Table 17

Hours of Graduate Education for Total Group

Hours	Males N	Males %	Females N	Females %	Total N	Total %
0	525	51	616	78	1,141	63
1 - 12	116	11	67	8	183	10
13 - 24	130	13	39	5	169	9
25 - 36	86	8	38	5	124	7
37 - 48	57	6	17	2	74	4
49 - 60	23	2	5	1	28	2
61+	97	9	7	1	104	5

N = 1,823

Personal Statistics

Fifty-two per cent of the women were married in comparison with only 29 per cent of the men. Eleven per cent of the women had from one to three children below school age, and 34 per cent of the women had from one to six children of school age. Table 20 presents the marital status of enrollees and Tables 21, 22, and 23 present the number of women with children, the number of women with pre-school children and the number of women with school-age children, respectively. Since many women had children both of pre-school age and school age, the per cents shown in Tables 22 and 23 do not coincide with Table 21 which shows the total number of women with children from birth through 18 years of age.

Table 18

Hours of Graduate Education for Elementary Group

Hours	Males N	Males %	Females N	Females %	Total N	Total %
0	292	57	474	81	766	70
1 - 12	52	10	48	8	100	9
13 - 24	63	12	27	5	90	8
25 - 36	38	7	18	3	48	4
37 - 48	20	4	10	2	30	3
49 - 60	7	1	1	0	8	1
61+	46	9	6	1	52	5

N = 1,102

Table 19

Hours of Graduate Education for Secondary Group

Hours	Males N	Males %	Females N	Females %	Total N	Total %
0	233	45	142	70	375	52
1 - 12	64	12	19	9	83	12
13 - 24	67	13	12	6	79	11
25 - 36	48	9	20	10	68	9
37 - 48	37	7	7	3	44	6
49 - 60	16	3	4	2	20	3
61+	51	10	1	0	52	7

N = 721

Table 20

Marital Status

Status	Males N	Males %	Females N	Females %	Total N	Total %
Single	719	70	309	39	1,028	57
Married	296	29	423	52	719	39
Widowed	2	0	13	2	15	1
Divorced	15	1	28	4	43	2
Separated	2	0	16	2	18	1

N = 1,823

Table 21

Number of Women with Children Birth to 17 Years of Age

Number of Children	Elementary N	Elementary %	Secondary N	Secondary %	Total N	Total %
0	326	56	141	68	467	59
1	70	12	22	12	92	12
2	102	17	29	15	131	17
3	56	10	7	3	63	8
4	18	3	4	2	22	3
5	4	1	1	0	5	1
6	4	1	0	0	4	0
7	1	0	0	0	1	0
8	1	0	0	0	1	0

N = 786

Previous Job Experience

Since 53 per cent of the trainees were under 25 years of age and more than 40 per cent had been candidates for the baccalaureate degree immediately prior to the program, only full-time job experience was tabulated.[2]

---

[2] A special report is being prepared at The City College of New York relating to the job experience of the ITTP trainees and their reasons for changing careers.

Table 22

Number of Women with Children Below School Age (Birth to 5 Years)[a]

Number of Children	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	50	9	16	8	66	8
2	18	3	5	2	23	3
3	3	0	1	0	4	0

N = 786

[a] Per cents will not coincide with per cents in Table 21 because of overlap of women with both school age and pre-school age children.

Table 23

Number of Women with Children of School Age (6 through 18 Years)[a]

Number of Children	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	69	12	19	9	88	11
2	91	16	24	12	115	15
3	45	8	3	1	48	6
4	15	3	1	0	16	2
5	1	0	0	0	1	0
6	3	0	0	0	3	0

N = 786

[a] Per cents will not coincide with per cents in Table 21 because of overlap of women with both school age and pre-school age children.

Thirty-one per cent of the total group were full-time students and reported no full-time employment. Another five per cent were employed in teacher-related fields such as non-public school teacher, college instructor, etc. Eleven per cent of the total group were housewives. Only 19 per cent were employed in professional or semi-professional fields related to their undergraduate training.

Table 24 summarizes the job experience of those trainees who had one or more years of full-time employment.

Table 24

Employment Prior to ITTP

Employment	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student	314	31	226	31	540	31
Teaching-Related	44	4	47	7	91	5
Professional & Semi-Professional	182	18	145	20	327	19
Managerial & Proprietor	79	8	33	5	112	7
Clerical & Kindred	168	17	132	18	300	17
Sales	40	4	56	8	96	6
Craft	12	1	7	1	19	1
Unskilled	21	2	32	4	53	3
Housewife	150	15	42	6	192	11

N = 1,730

Attitudes toward Teaching

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, an instrument designed to predict how well a teacher will get along with pupils in interpersonal relationships, and how well satisfied he will be with teaching as a vocation, was administered to 1,816 of the trainees in the first week of the summer program. The elementary group had a mean score of 44.04 and the secondary group had a mean of 28.34. This placed the elementary group in the 23rd percentile in relation to undergraduate beginning elementary education majors, and the secondary group in the 30th percentile in relation to undergraduate beginning secondary education majors. This would tend to categorize the group as conservative in their views of educational philosophy. The authors of the test caution that since the scores on the Inventory reflect their educational philosophy, the user must determine whether or not the philosophy reflected corresponds with that of his own before making use of the norms provided. Recent studies on school climate imply that city school systems tend to be conservative in their overall organizational climate and that city teachers are more conservative in their educational philosophies than those who choose suburban or rural careers.

Summary

The program recruited college graduates who had neither the experience of supervised teaching nor courses in education in their college training. Of the 3,400 candidates notified of acceptance to the program, 2,110 registered and 1,858 successfully completed the summer course of study. A total of 1,629 attended the fall seminars in which 1,492 received a passing grade.

The program recruited a slightly larger per cent of men than women. The men, as a group, tended to be younger. Forty-three per cent of the trainees had received their baccalaureate degrees in the month previous to the program. Less than one-third had received degrees prior to 1960.

The majority of trainees were native to New York City and had attended college in the city. Sixty-three per cent had taken no graduate college courses.

CHAPTER IV

DATA CONCERNING THE SUMMER AND FALL PROGRAMS

Summer Program

Of the 2,110 candidates who registered for the summer program, 1,858 successfully completed the course of study. The 12 per cent who failed to complete the program included 105 candidates who withdrew during the summer and 153 who received failing grades (see Table 3).

Each trainee who withdrew from the program was requested to submit a written report of his reason for dropping out of the program. Table 25 presents a summarized tabulation of reasons for withdrawal. Eleven candidates were forced

Table 25

Reason for Withdrawal from Summer Program

Reason	Number
1. Job conflict (time)	17
2. Personal reasons	16
3. Financial	11
4. Changed mind about teaching	11
5. Accepted another job	9
6. Wished to continue regular degree program	7
7. Did not want assigned teaching level	6
8. Illness	6
9. Failed qualifying exam[a]	5
10. Had to travel too great a distance	4
11. Already had necessary credits to teach	4
12. Did not meet undergraduate requirements[a]	3
13. Physical disability[a]	3
14. Family illness	2
15. Military duty	1
Total	105

[a] Some of the trainees were notified that they did not meet the requirements for the conditional license after the program had begun.

to withdraw because of failure to meet the New York City Board of Education qualifications for the conditional license. The largest number, 17, withdrew because the class time conflicted with a summer job. Sixteen drop-outs gave only "personal reasons"; 11 gave financial reasons and 11 changed their minds about teaching.

Distribution of Summer Grades

The grade average for trainees in the entire program was 2.79 or a letter grade of B-. Only 10 per cent of the entire group earned a grade average below 2.00, equal to a letter grade of C. Trainees were allowed only three unexcused absences per course. Attendance records showed that only a small per cent took full advantage of this option. Grades were dependent upon classroom participation, classroom tests and a standard program mid-term and final examination in each course.

Table 26 presents a distribution of grade averages for the elementary, secondary and total groups of trainees. Each trainee received undergraduate college credit for these courses.

Fall Seminars

Each trainee who successfully completed the summer course of study was supposed to have been assigned to a full-time teaching position and was expected to register for the fall seminar. Thirty-four seminars were scheduled, located at 30 public schools and two each at The City College uptown and downtown campuses.

Of the 1,858 who were eligible, 1,679 signed up for the course. Of these, only 1,644 accepted positions in the New York City public schools. Fifty of those registering for the course did not appear or withdrew soon after the start of the seminars. Another 55 accepted assignments but did not register for the seminars. These trainees were excused by the Board of Education because of a conflict in time of the scheduled course, distance from the nearest center, or because they had previously taken a course which the Board of Education felt could be substituted for the required seminar. Those who were excused from registration because of a valid conflict agreed to enroll in an approved graduate education course in the spring semester at their own expense.

Table 26

Distribution of Grade Averages for Summer Program[a]

Grade Average	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%[b]	N	%[b]	N	%[b]
3.8 - 4.0	135	11	32	4	167	8
3.5 - 3.7	117	10	102	13	219	12
3.2 - 3.4	233	19	155	20	388	19
2.9 - 3.1	279	23	169	22	448	22
2.6 - 2.8	168	14	122	15	290	15
2.3 - 2.5	108	9	92	12	200	10
2.0 - 2.2	49	4	31	4	80	4
1.7 - 1.9	13	1	16	2	29	1
1.4 - 1.6	17	1	0	0	17	1
1.1 - 1.3	1	0	5	1	6	0
F (Failed)	100	8	53	7	153	8
WD (Withdrew)	64		41		105	
I or No Grade	3		5		8	
Mean	2.80[b]		2.78[b]		2.79[b]	
Standard Deviation	.98		.90		.95	

N = 2,110

[a] A = 4.0, B = 3.0, C = 2.0, D = 1.0, F = 0

[b] Does not include WD or I

Table 27 presents a summary of the assignments for the 1,699 ITTP's.

Distribution of Fall Seminar Grades

Of the 1,679 who registered for the fall seminar, 1,483 successfully passed the course. Less than 30 per cent received a letter grade below B. Of the 196 not passing the course, 142 failed because of excess absence and 50 withdrew or did not appear for classes. Remarkably, only four were failed because of inadequate performance in the course. It may be that others with-

Table 27

Fall Assignments

Common Branches	
Registered, fall course	814
Did not register	27
Junior H. S. or Intermediate School	
Registered, fall course	449
Did not register	19
Senior H. S. or Vocational H. S.	
Registered, Fall course	121
Did not register	9
District Office	
Registered, fall course	108
Non-Public School	
Registered, fall course	152
Total	1,699

drew rather than continue with the expectation of a failing grade. Table 28 presents a distribution of the grades for the elementary, secondary, and total groups of trainees. Each trainee who passed the course received two points of graduate credit.

After-School Workshops

All of the trainees were eligible to enroll in the after-school workshops, which were set up by the New York City Board of Education. These workshops were set up for all recently licensed teachers, regulars and substitutes who had been assigned to special service, transitional, or open enrollment schools. Registration and attendance was voluntary. The sessions met for two hours a week. In some schools they were scheduled for one hour, twice a week and in some schools they met once a week, for two hours. The workshops were inaugurated in October, 1966 and terminated on May 15, 1967. A total of 515 of the trainees enrolled and attended these workshops. The object of the workshops was to allow the principals and field superintendents to adapt an in-service

Table 28

Distribution of Grades for Fall Seminar

Grade	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	189	18.2	131	20.4	320	19.0
B	512	49.4	329	51.2	841	50.1
C	198	19.1	114	17.8	312	18.6
D	7	0.7	3	0.5	10	0.6
F (Failed)	2	0.2	2	0.3	4	0.2
H (Failed, Excessive Absence)	94	9.0	48	7.5	142	8.5
J (Withdrew)	35	3.4	15	2.3	50	3.0
Total	1,037		642		1,679	

N = 1,679

program to the needs of the particular school, community and participants. A publication, Guidelines for After-School Workshops, was prepared for the New York City Board of Education by the Office of Personnel. This manual offered suggestions for the conduct of the workshops. Since the present report is concerned primarily with the University's activities, the in-service workshops are not specifically evaluated here.

Opinions of Trainees and Staff about the Summer Programs

Trainees' Evaluation of Summer Courses

On the last day of the summer session, the trainees were asked to evaluate their courses in relation to amount of content, level of thinkig, structure and organization, and freedom to initiate one's own learning. They were also asked to rate themselves on a seven-point scale, on various aspects of professional teaching competence.

Almost all of the ratings were highly positive with little variation in the answers. The evaluation team felt that it would be more valid to repoll the group on these aspects after they had the experience of at least one semester of full-time teaching. The results of that questionnaire are reviewed in Chapter VI.

Administrators' Evaluations of Summer Courses

At the close of the summer session, the administrators of the program offered the following recommendations:

The elementary and secondary programs should be housed in different buildings. Such separate housing would permit different time schedules (e.g., 50-minute periods for one group, 75-minute periods for the other), loudspeaker announcements for routine notices instead of relying on the auditorium sessions where communication was more difficult, and easier organization of activities. Individual supplementary libraries could also be maintained more easily. For special events which both groups should experience but which cannot be duplicated, a very large auditorium or a closed-circuit TV system would be needed.

If numbers permit, all classes should be scheduled in the morning for all students. The daily schedule should be long enough (perhaps four hours) to permit some free time for every student. This would allow for conferences with instructors and advisers, and for visits to the library of supplementary readings.

The elementary education classes should be housed in one or more elementary school buildings, in each of which there is a regular program of summer school, covering a sampling of the various grade levels (e.g., second, fourth, and sixth grades). These should not be special-project classes, such as Head Start, but an extension of the regular school year. These classes would be used extensively for observation and for a modified version of practice teaching.

In the same manner, the secondary education classes should be housed in a building in which a regular secondary summer school is being conducted, so that observations and practice-teaching can be carried out.

For an eight-credit program, an eight-week session would be more desirable than the seven-week one. This might be divided into two four-week sessions, with two courses given in each session. This would give the instructors an opportunity to have a vacation either before or after the four-week session they select. Students and teachers alike found it difficult to cope with the volume of material in the time available, even when the volume was cut by careful selection of topics instead of trying to cover everything.

The basic concept of the team organization was excellent, and it worked well. However, it seems to need modification, for these reasons and in these ways:

a. the schedule reduction was too great, especially in the case of elementary education, where course and team leaders typically taught a single three-credit course out of an eight-credit schedule.

b. the best teachers were often the ones selected to be team or course leaders, with the result that they taught only one-half or two-thirds as many students as their colleagues.

c. the leaders' free time for counseling or interviewing students was poorly used, since the class scheduling was so tight that a student had to absent himself from regular sessions to see an adviser.

Alternative arrangements:

a. All teachers should cover six credits of classwork (two three-credit courses or three two-credit courses). Team leaders should be given one or two extra credits for their supervisory and advisory duties.

b. Extra credit should be given to the course leader, but sections should be combined in larger groups, with a team leader who does no teaching but carries a full-time administrative assignment. This would be particularly suitable if two or three buildings were used to house the classes.

The persons teaching the psychology courses were not sufficiently involved in the team process. There seem to be several factors involved in that result: they were hired at the last minute in many cases, during the week just before the opening of class; the orientation they received was directed toward their own course, and the orientation given to the total group was directed chiefly toward the methodology course instructors instead of toward the integration of the program; the image that the methodologists had of the psychologists was not always a favorable one or at least did not envisage them as being able to make a contribution to the elementary or secondary school curriculum or even much of a contribution to methodology outside of such topics as discipline problems; it is even possible that some of the psychologists were viewed as being impractical theorists, since some of them were recent Ph.D.'s with little or no elementary or secondary school experience.

As the summer progressed, some of these problems straightened themselves out, but others were aggravated. A few team leaders tended to ignore the opinions of the psychologists or brush them aside. On the other hand, some of the psychologists skipped team meetings or professed to find little of value in them. In fact, one or two thought it a waste of time to attend the large group sessions in the auditorium, when teaching methods were being demonstrated with classes of neighborhood children as subjects.

More and earlier conversations with the psychologists should have been conducted by the director and the coordinators and the team leaders, to involve them and to enable them to make a maximum contribution.

CHAPTER V

ASSIGNMENTS OF TRAINEES

One of the unique features of the ITTP was the arrangement by which enrollees were guaranteed assignments if they satisfactorily completed the requirements. This guarantee was probably a major factor both in recruitment and in the seriousness with which the trainees viewed their training. At the same time, difficulties were created when the number of successful trainees in a particular field of teaching exceeded vacancies, requiring the assignment of some trainees to other kinds of positions.

It was not possible to establish the relationship between assignment and retention in the program, as initial assignments were unobtainable for 72 trainees who did not register for the fall seminars and who left their teaching assignments early in the year.

A total of 1,858 trainees successfully passed the summer courses and were eligible to accept full-time teaching assignments in the New York City public schools. Of these, 1,771 actually accepted the assignments offered. The remaining 87 did not accept assignments for a variety of reasons. Chief among these was the nature of the assignment. A total of 380 trainees had prepared for senior high school positions; however, only 130 positions were available. Many of this group felt that they did not want to teach at a lower grade level. A few found that they could actually qualify for a regular permanent substitute license, and several accepted positions in school systems outside of New York City. Twelve trainees were notified that although they had successfully completed the summer course of study, they had failed one or another of the eligibility requirements, such as the physical examination. A small number decided to continue graduate study or gave no reason at all.

Table 29 outlines the area and number of full-time assignments accepted.

Each trainee who accepted an assignment was supposed to register for the fall seminar given by The City College. One hundred twenty-seven trainees who were offered appointments failed to register for the course for reasons outlined in Chapter IV. The 1,771 assignments were divided among 353 elementary, 140 junior high or intermediate, 44 senior high, 14 vocational high and 101 non-public schools throughout the five boroughs of New York City. In addition,

Table 29

ITTP Assignments

Assignment Area	Elementary	Secondary	Total
Common Branches	912	-	912
Junior H. S. or Intermediate	-	524	524
Senior H. S.	-	100	100
Vocational H. S.	-	30	30
District Office	20	33	53
Non-Public School	152	-	152
Total	1,084	687	1,771

trainees were sent to 25 district offices. Table 30 lists the appointments by borough, both for those trainees who registered and those who did not register for the fall seminar. It was not possible to verify the assignments of 72 trainees who did not register for the fall seminars and did not show up for their assignment, or who resigned soon after school began. Twenty-six trainees (12 elementary and 14 junior high school) who registered for the fall seminar did not accept their assignments.

Non-Public School Assignments

The 152 trainees who were assigned to the non-public schools were appointed as elementary remedial reading and remedial arithmetic specialists under a special program for the non-public schools sponsored by the New York City Board of Education and financed by Title I of the United States Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Of the 152, 101 trainees were assigned as reading specialists and 51 as arithmetic specialists.[1]

Soon after the beginning of the program 19 reading and six arithmetic trainees were sent back to the public school program or resigned. The remaining 127 trainees persisted through the entire year.

---

[1] A special evaluative report on this program is being prepared by the Center for Urban Education, 33 West 42nd Street, New York, N. Y. 10036.

Table 30

Assignments by Borough

Assignment	Number of Appointments: Registered for Fall Course	Number of Appointments: Did not Register	Number of Schools
Common Branch			
Brooklyn	276	11	124
Manhattan	121	4	63
Queens	142	4	61
Bronx	289	8	74
Richmond	16	-	9
Non-Public Schools	152	-	101
Junior H. S. or I. S.			
Brooklyn	183	8	48
Manhattan	74	4	24
Queens	77	2	36
Bronx	135	4	29
Richmond	9	1	3
Senior H. S.			
Brooklyn	19	3	12
Manhattan	17	3	7
Queens	36	-	16
Bronx	16	2	6
Richmond	4	-	3
Vocational H. S.			
Brooklyn	5	1	4
Manhattan	17	-	7
Queens	3	-	2
Bronx	4	-	1
Richmond	-	-	-
Unable to locate[a]	-	72	-
District Office	53	-	-
Total	1,644	127	630

[a] These trainees dropped out early in the year.

Holding Power

Of the 1,644 trainees who were offered positions and registered for the Fall seminars, 1,528 were still teaching full-time as of May 15, 1967. Of the 127 who were offered positions but did not register for the seminar, 55 were still teaching.

In total, 1,583 out of 1,858 who were eligible to teach were holding full-time positions through May. This represented 1,583 out of 1,771 who accepted appointments. Thus, 85.2 per cent of those eligible to teach or 89.4 per cent of those who accepted appointments were teaching in full-time positions in May. This does not imply, however, that each trainee remained in the same assignment or school throughout the year. Out of 1,227 trainees rated by public school principals, 129 were given different assignments during the first semester of school or at the end of it. Twenty-five who were assigned to the non-public schools were also reassigned.

At the date of this report, it is impossible to foretell how many of these trainees will apply for regular permanent substitute licenses and remain in the school system.

2

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF TRAINEES' AND INSTRUCTORS' OPINIONS OF THE INTENSIVE TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAM

After one semester of teaching, the trainees were mailed an open-ended questionnaire[1] to assess their opinions regarding the major strengths and weaknesses of the program. The primary yield of such a questionnaire was expected to be in the wide variety of particular characteristics considered by the trainees to be strong and weak features and in the value of these opinions as stimuli for change in possible subsequent programs. Since the questionnaire was open-ended, the answers were subjective in nature. As in any opinion survey, the answers reflected the opinions of the trainees at this particular period of their careers.

Although it was theoretically possible for such a questionnaire to result in as many different responses as there were respondents, many characteristics were reported with noteworthy frequency. Tables 31 and 32 show a categorized itemization of the trainees' reports of strengths and weaknesses and a frequency breakdown, according to teaching assignment, of the number of trainees expressing each opinion. An additional benefit of the open-ended questionnaire was the opportunity for relatively unrestricted personal expression which gave qualities of specificity and vividness to the replies that were not reflected in the frequency tabulation. Samples of these expressions are quoted in the discussion of the tables.

As originally planned, the forms would have been filled out in the fall seminar classes at the last session. A mixup in the mailing procedure necessitated that the forms be sent to the individual trainees, which was done on March 3, 1967. This resulted in a return of only 778 forms by May 1, 1967, in time to be included in the analysis. This represented a sample of only 43.9 per cent of all of the trainees who had been offered teaching assignments. Because of the data processing time schedule, it was not possible to include those questionnaires received after the cutoff date in the present analysis. Due to the limited sample of replies analyzed, the responses may not be representative of the opinions of the total group of trainees.

---

[1] See Form V, Appendix B

Table 31

Analysis of the Strengths of the ITTP as Reported by ITTP Graduates Teaching in Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, High Schools, and Non-Public Schools

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
General Assessments of the Program								
1. Opportunity to gain some familiarity with teaching; a basic introduction to theory, methods, routines, terminology; a general idea of what to expect	65	16.4	36	15.5	10	11.9	6	9.1
2. Offered good or adequate preparation for teaching	36	9.1	9	3.9	6	7.1	3	4.5
3. Attempt to stress practical aspects of teaching, to cover essentials and minimize irrelevancies	23	5.8	39	16.8	15	17.8	7	10.6
4. Preparation for understanding and working with children of "disadvantaged" backgrounds	19	4.8	9	3.9	2	2.4	1	1.5
5. Appropriate training method (emphasizing the short period of time and ease of entry into teaching) in view of the inevitable gap between theory and practice and the belief that you learn to teach only by teaching.	7	1.8	17	7.3	9	10.7	0	0.0
6. Preparation in effective teaching methods	0	0.0	30	12.9	12	14.3	0	0.0
7. Attempt at a realistic presentation of the problems of teaching in New York City schools	0	0.0	28	12.1	0	0.0	0	
Job-Career Orientation								
8. Opportunity for capable, interested people from various training and career backgrounds to enter	65	16.4	18	7.8	8	9.5	9	13.6

	Elementary		JHS		HS		Non-Public	
	N = 396		N = 232		N = 84		N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
teaching; opportunity to teach without following traditional education sequence at sacrifice of liberal arts								
9. Opportunity to get a teaching license in a short time	22	5.6	17	7.3	0	0.0	9	13.6
10. Eased the emergency shortage of teachers	7	1.8	1	0.4	0	0.0	2	3.0
11. Fact that the program was free--enabled people to afford the opportunity	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
Instruction								
12. Instruction by principals and other experienced school personnel rather than by college professors who have no contact with public school classroom situations; offered much in the way of practical advice	51	12.9	30	12.9	18	21.4	10	15.2
13. High quality of instruction	32	8.1	33	14.2	16	19.0	7	10.6
14. Some instructors provided security and support; their enthusiasm communicated a sense of importance of the program	27	6.8	11	4.7	6	7.1	7	10.6
15. A particular instructor--singled out either for excellence of instruction, emphasis on practical aids, personal dedication, or concern for participants	0	0.0	4	1.7	3	3.6	4	6.1
Skills and Procedures								
16. Learned how to plan a lesson	13	3.3	28	12.1	10	11.9	1	1.5
17. Offered suggested methods for motivating a class	4	1.0	6	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18. Preparation for establishing classroom routines	0	0.0	14	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Courses								
19. Curriculum - excellent instruction, strong practical emphasis	40	10.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
20. General methods course	0	0.0	28	12.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
21. Psychology - helpful for class discipline, understanding of children's behavior at different ages	17	4.3	10	4.3	2	2.4	4	6.1
22. Language Art and Reading	19	4.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	6.1
23. Fall workshop--did not feel left out in cold after summer program, place to bring on-the-job problems	14	3.5	8	3.4	6	7.1	3	4.5
24. Good course offerings for an introductory program --balanced, comprehensive	3	0.8	6	2.6	4	4.8	4	6.1
Teaching Aids								
25. Classroom observation (either a field trip to a summer class or a filmed lesson)	4	1.0	4	1.7	2	2.4	0	0.0
26. Manuals distributed by the Board of Education	22	5.6	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	1.5
27. Assembly programs--lectures and demonstrations	19	4.8	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	3.0
28. Practice in giving a simulated lesson	0	0.0	2	0.9	5	6.0	0	0.0
29. Guest Speakers--civil rights leaders, neighborhood representatives	0	0.0	2	0.9	0	0.0	2	3.0

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Well-organized text and reference materials	0	0.0	3	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Miscellaneous								
31. Small ITTP classes	9	2.3	4	1.7	1	1.2	6	9.1
32. Going through the experience with people who share your goals and concerns—source of confidence, lessening of anxiety, sense of importance and need	2	0.5	5	2.2	1	1.2	2	3.0
33. Quality of colleagues: mature, knowledgeable, enthusiastic, of diverse backgrounds	0	0.0	9	3.9	1	1.2	1	1.5
34. Good introduction to the workings of the Board of Education	0	0.0	2	0.9	1	1.2	0	0.0
No Strengths	31	7.8	2	0.9	2	2.4	3	4.5

Table 32

Analysis of the Weaknesses of the ITTP as Reported by ITTP Graduates Teaching in Elementary Schools, Junior High Schools, High Schools, and Non-Public Schools

	Elementary		JHS		HS		Non-Public	
	N = 396		N = 232		N = 84		N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Method of Training								
1. Absence of student teaching experience	135	34.1	67	28.9	35	41.7	22	33.3
2. Absence of classroom observation	73	18.4	22	9.5	7	8.3	8	12.1
3. No supervision on the job	21	5.3	8	3.4	0	0.0	1	1.5
4. Lack of placement in classes of master teacher for first semester	2	0.5	0	0.0	2	2.4	0	0.0
General Assessment ofthe Program								
5. Presented an ideal image of teaching--did not prepare for the reality, especially in special service schools, of the needs and problems of disadvantaged children or for the generally found atypical situations (in terms of intelligence levels, motivation, disruptiveness, class size)	80	20.2	40	17.2	8	9.5	6	9.1
6. Avoidance of the nature of the problem of discipline (which is seen to be a major problem in the New York City schools) and lack of preparation for coping with it	58	14.6	44	19.0	6	7.1	1	1.5
7. In general, the courses were too theoretical, not practical enough	53	13.4	32	13.8	4	4.8	9	13.6
8. Time period too short for adequate preparation	30	7.6	13	5.6	4	4.8	1	1.5

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. Insufficient emphasis on methods ("tricks," "gimmicks") of teaching	40	10.1	5	2.2	2	2.4	8	12.1
10. Attempt to prepare for total curriculum and full range of children in terms of age and ability. Suggestion is for grade assignment to be made at beginning of program; this would facilitate absorption of the more restricted course content, render it more applicable to the actual teaching assignment, and would enable the candidate to undertake more preparation on his own	15	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5
11. Insufficient information about actual curriculum in the NYC schools	8	2.0	5	2.2	1	1.2	1	1.5
12. Too much time spent on background--history and development of education	3	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0
13. Unprepared for dealing with administration and Board of Education	3	0.8	5	2.2	2	2.4	0	0.0
14. Program too superficial, not intensive enough	0	0.0	3	1.3	1	1.2	0	0.0
Specific Skills and Procedures								
15. Insufficient preparation for day-to-day classroom and school-wide routines: lining up, handing out materials, fire drills, contacting parents	27	6.8	12	5.2	0	0.0	1	1.5
16. Absence of training for clerical tasks	16	4.0	22	9.5	4	4.8	4	6.1
17. Insufficient training in lesson planning	26	6.6	5	2.2	1	1.2	3	4.5

		Elementary		JHS		HS		Non-Public	
		N = 396		N = 232		N = 84		N = 66	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18.	Insufficient preparation for use of available materials: texts, duplicating processes, mountings, slides, etc.	6	1.5	3	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
19.	Absence of instruction in modern math	7	1.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
20.	Did not teach how to teach reading	4	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
21.	Insufficient information about obtaining aides (BCG, guidance counselors)	3	0.8	0	0.0	1	1.2	0	0.0
Courses									
22.	Insufficient emphasis on interpersonal relations within the school setting (teacher-pupil, teacher-administrator)	3	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5
23.	Child Development--emphasized theoretical aspects and early development instead of using practical case study approach of relevant ages; unnecessary because many candidates had had similar course on undergraduate level	40	10.1	14	6.0	5	6.0	5	7.6
24.	Fall workshop--"gripe session" with little constructive help	0	0.0	9	3.9	2	2.4	0	0.0
25.	Curriculum	6	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5
26.	Methods	0	0.0	3	1.3	1	1.2	0	0.0
27.	Language Arts	2	0.5	1	0.4	0	0.0	3	4.5
28.	Course overlap (specifically the two methods courses)	0	0.0	6	2.6	4	4.8	0	0.0
Instruction									
29.	Poor quality of instruction	9	2.3	4	1.7	0	0.0	7	10.6

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30. Instruction was below the mental level of the participants	4	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
31. Instructors who were public school administrators were too far removed from the reality of the classroom	4	1.0	3	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
32. A particular teacher (unprepared, completely theoretical without attempting to come to grips with actual classroom situations, reliance solely on texts).	3	0.8	0	0.0	2	0.9	3	4.5
Teaching Aids								
33. Assembly sessions--generally valueless content, physical set-up made attention impossible, completely inadequate as a substitute for actual classroom observation	31	7.8	21	9.0	13	15.5	9	13.6
34. Texts ("absurd," "too involved," "boring," "too theoretical")--predigested mimeographed notes or more manuals should be substituted	5	1.3	3	1.3	1	1.2	1	1.5
35. Too heavy homework load	2	0.5	4	1.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Assignment Policy								
36. Assignment out of license (JHS instead of HS, different subject)--disregard for specialization and training	0	0.0	39	16.8	12	14.3	1	1.5
37. Unkept promise about not being assigned to special service schools or to most difficult classes	14	3.5	12	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0

	Elementary N = 396		JHS N = 232		HS N = 84		Non-Public N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
38. No regular teaching assignment the first semester ("pool sub," "above-quota" teacher)	0	0.0	5	2.2	1	1.2	0	0.0
39. Preparation not relevant to assignment ("we were given adequate preparation for a subject we were not assigned to teach")	0	0.0	5	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
40. Assignment should have been made at beginning of program with relevant subsequent training	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	4.5
Administration								
41. Poor communication between administrators of the program and the participants--ambiguity about further academic requirements, certification requirements (implied is need for a counseling service)	8	2.0	7	3.0	1	1.2	2	3.0
42. Lack of coordination between ITTP and other units of City University (acceptance of ITTP credits only by City College's graduate program of education)	2	0.5	2	0.9	0	0.0	1	1.5
43. Insufficient information given to public school officials about the program and the newly arrived teachers, sometimes resulting in a resentful attitude and generally poor treatment	8	2.0	6	2.6	1	1.2	0	0.0
44. Should include plan to carry participants through the additional professional courses needed to meet licensing requirements	0	0.0	7	3.0	2	2.4	2	3.0
Candidate Selection								
45. Lack of assessment of emotional stability in terms of gross unsuitability (either by admis-	2	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5

	Elementary		JHS		HS		Non-Public	
	N = 396		N = 232		N = 84		N = 66	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
45. (Continued) sions interview or by evaluation by instructor at end of course)								
No weaknesses	5	1.3	3	1.3	2	2.4	2	3.0

Strengths

The most frequently reported strengths were groundwork preparation and general familiarization with teaching, instruction by people with immediate classroom experience who were generous with practical advice, and the opportunity for beginning a teaching career.

In the words of some of the trainees:

> "It gave me some theoretical and practical grounding in the problems to be encountered in elementary school teaching."
>
> "The ITTP provided the fundamental necessities for beginning teachers. I did receive enough training to meet classroom needs."
>
> "I could not possibly handle a new class without the concentrated ITT program, especially after being away from formal education for over 20 years. Oftentimes I recall the many and varied suggestions given to the class by the excellent instructors in the ITT program. The ITT program undoubtedly prepares teachers far better than the teachers recently graduated from college."
>
> "Our curriculum instructor covered the area with such depth that when I feel capable about handling a situation, I give all the credit to (him). He detailed the situations that were later experienced. There was a 'Benny in my class' and I did face crises on several occasions. He knew. He told us and we did remember. (He) gave us the practical side of teaching. He alerted us to difficulties not realized. His sense of humor protected us from the seriousness of the average teacher's experiences. He projected us beyond the difficulties into a professional area of capability, confidence, and dedication. I thank him. ITTP had an enrichment in these principals who gave us their experience."
>
> "I am enjoying my teaching experience very much and I would say that no day in the classroom passes without some bit of information from my summer and fall courses being of help to me."

In regard to the feature of providing entree to the teaching profession, there were some differences between the evaluations of the elementary and secondary level trainees. For the elementary ITT's, the career opportunity offered by the program seemed to be of somewhat greater importance than it was for the secondary ITT's. Thirty per cent of the elementary group thought that a major strength of the program was its providing the opportunity for capable people from a variety of backgrounds to begin teaching without having followed a lengthy specialized training program. Only 17 per cent of the secondary group reported this as a major strength. Nineteen per cent of the elementary group, but only seven per cent of the secondary group, considered it a strength of the program that it simply provided a chance to obtain a teaching license in the shortest time possible. A slight difference in frequency holds even in the less personal aspect of career concern, where roughly five per cent of the elementary group thought a strength of the program was in easing the teacher shortage, while only one person, or 0.4 per cent, of the secondary group mentioned this feature.

The elementary and secondary trainees also differed in some of the other areas. The secondary group reported the program to emphasize practical aspects of training more than the elementary group. In line with their more frequent general assessment of the program as being more practical, they gave more reports of specific practical help, e.g., in planning lessons, in establishing classroom routines, in giving simulated lessons. About 13 per cent of the secondary group praised the program for preparing them in effective teaching methods, whereas no elementary participant mentioned this specific characteristic. Apparently finding preparation in the above-mentioned basic procedures to be insufficient or absent, the elementary group was somewhat more grateful for the specific teaching aides that were included in their program. They praised the Board of Education manuals and the demonstration films and lessons somewhat more than the secondary group.

The secondary group more frequently expressed the view that the ITTP method was the appropriate kind of training for a profession that could best be learned by on-the-job experience. For example:

> "I think it basically showed that a teacher should spend more time in the field of student teaching rather than four years of classroom lecture."
>
> "If I learned anything this year it is that nothing takes the place of experience."
>
> "The teacher learns how to teach only by teaching."
>
> "Had we had practical classroom experience for that length of time, I'm sure we would have fared much better."

> "The major strength was its length. I feel I did as well if not better than many of the ed. majors who began teaching in my school this year. To major in ed. is a waste of much undergraduate time. The ITTP program let me fulfill my desire--to teach--while at the same time I was able to spend my four undergraduate years taking the maximum amount of credits in what I love most--English."

The secondary group seemed sufficiently impressed with the positive qualities of their colleagues to mention this as one of the major strengths of the program. They also stressed as an important feature of the program its allowance for people who were well-qualified in specific content areas, but with minimal education background, to enter teaching.

> "Most of the ITTP'ers of my acquaintance are hard workers. They are dedicated individuals, fully cognizant of their academic and professional limitations, but willing to do their job in spite of all obstacles. At my school only one ITTP'er resigned during the first semester. I think the Board of Education has received (and will continue to receive) a fair shake from its ITTP graduates. I think the program should be continued."

While the group as a whole viewed the practical experience of the instructors as a major strength, the secondary trainees further praised the instructors for their quality of teaching more than the elementary teachers did, while the elementary trainees were relatively stronger in their praise of the instructors' offers of support and their enthusiasm for the program.

Weaknesses

In criticizing the program, the one weakness that was reported with greatest frequency (33 per cent) across all of the trainee groups was the absence of student teaching experience.

> "The program must be revised!!! There must be provision for actual observance of classroom situations. No amount of lecturing to huge audiences of simulated classes of scrubbed children can provide training for those completely unprepared for the class responsibility... Please--more on the job experience before you dump more untrained people into the Board of Ed."

"The program needs the crucial factor--children!!--and in class training."

"The program failed to give the teacher-candidates a chance to actually student teach. Therefore, when they began to really teach, the tension the first few weeks was really tremendous."

"I do wish to see this program continued--but only if more practical help will be incorporated into the program."

"I feel that much time and money was wasted in the ITTP, as the only real thing that was helpful was my own trial and errors made--and many errors would have been eliminated if given a chance to work them out during the summer."

"Although I have weathered the worst of this year and emerged triumphant, I believe that a year of internship and a gradual introduction to a full work load of teaching is essential in any future program of this sort."

The importance of the criticism of the absence of student teaching was underscored by another criticism of the program--that of assigning ITT's to special service schools and unusually difficult classes.

"I think the major weakness of the ITTP was the sending of teachers with no student teaching and a limited amount of education courses to teach in schools in deprived areas where the discipline problems were too difficult to cope with."

"Everyone I knew who took the ITTP Program was assigned a bottom or near-bottom class in a Special Service School, and we were not equipped to handle the discipline problems and the 'low mentalities' we were faced with."

The second most significant criticism, expressed perhaps with the most emotionality as well as with the most earnestness, was toward the general approach, seen by some of the critics as unwittingly, by others as purposefully, presenting an unrealistic, idealized image of teaching without any effort to come to grips with the nature and variety of problems that the trainees would have to face. Thus, many new teachers said they were overwhelmed by a double handicap; they entered the classroom lacking techniques to cope with classroom difficulties, and the shock effect that was consequently aroused inhibited their capacity for developing effective techniques of their own. The classroom problem that seems to have been singled out as the most difficult one for the new teachers--that of discipline--was also singled out as being particularly avoided or unrealistically treated. The secondary group was more frequently critical in this area than the elementary group.

> "There was entirely too much polite talk and downright ignoring of the awesome problems of the ghetto. As a result, I had to painfully feel my way through these first seven months. I did not expect miracles out of the program, but I did expect a gut-level approach and an intellectual honesty which, for the most part, was lacking."

> "The major weakness of the program, and the major weakness of the entire school system, is a lack of respect for reality. About one hour of the whole program was spent on the subject 'discipline.' One professor actually told us if we were good teachers and nice people we would have no problems with discipline. The nicest and best teacher in the world would get murdered if he did not set up rules and routines, strictly and fairly enforce them and show the pupils he is in complete control. My teachers either believed, or, more likely, wanted us to believe, that tedious, repetitive enforcement of conduct rules was not an integral part of teaching. In either case their attitude is unrealistic for they are either fools--who do not understand what is going on--or liars--who, because they did not trust the motives of those in the program, kept the truth to themselves... The program, like the school system itself, suffered (still suffers) from an unrealistic viewpoint, lack of brainpower and a tremendous dearth of courage."

> "I came out of the program enthused and raring to go. However, I'm afraid we were the lambs led to the slaughter."

"I felt the ITTP was unfair in not telling us the actual conditions we should expect to find in the schools we were being sent. The instructors skirted the issue."

"It failed in every respect to prepare teachers for facing the classroom situation."

"Why didn't you really tell us about these kids and their needs?"

"Some method must be devised by someone so that teachers know what to expect and how to deal with what they meet the first day (and year) in a 'special service' school. Films perhaps could be made to show the actual situation. More discussion of the methods of capturing the attention of indifferent students would be helpful (hypnotism, magic, karate)... Also, more group discussions and suggestions on how to handle such things as cheating, the verbal assault on a scapegoat by other members of a class, and the proper role of teacher in controlling inter-class problems would have been helpful."

"It prepared me in no way for the classroom. I had no idea of what to expect, and the first few months of school were a shock!! I think it is brutal to throw someone into the classroom with no background, experience, etc. I would be curious to know what percentage of the people I went to CCNY with this summer are still teaching."

"It didn't in any way prepare us for the horrors of the classroom. It was much too theoretical and idealistic. They taught us what directions to give the children, but not what to do when the children say 'no' which is usually the case."

An interesting report related to this criticism came from those who were the older members of the group and had children of their own. Although they registered criticisms similar to those mentioned above, they seemed to feel that their personal life experiences enabled them to weather the difficulties better than some of the younger teachers.

"Did not prepare me for teaching in a special service where much more experience is needed to meet their many problems, especially N.E. speaking children. My age and having children of my own certainly were of great help to me my first few months."

"Our principal, among many others, believes that middle-aged mothers are the best teachers for disadvantaged first graders. I agree with him. There was much I could give these children that a young person just out of college could not."

Other criticisms mentioned relatively frequently by the group as a whole were in regard to the assembly lectures and to the child development course. The assembly programs were considered to be a nearly total waste of valuable time, and the child development course was criticized for being too theoretical and emphasizing early development instead of the application of psychological principles to classroom behavior.

The criticism that was applicable only to the secondary participants concerns the policy of assignment to schools. Sixteen per cent of the secondary group reported with considerable bitterness the inability on the part of the Board of Education to assign all people within their subject area and school level:

"The preparation and familiarity of the majority of us with a high school curriculum and methods of teaching to be followed by placement in the J.H.S. where such preparation was completely inadequate to cope with either the educational or behavioral situations."

"The inability to put me in the proper classroom. They did a fine job in preparing me to teach a subject I have not as yet had the opportunity of teaching."

The most striking overall impression about the participants' evaluations of the program was the overwhelming emphasis on practicality. If there was one theme that might be viewed as underlying a considerable majority of the wide range of reported strengths and weaknesses it was this one. Those instructors, courses, teaching aides, or general orientations that were viewed as directly applicable in their own teaching situations were considered the major strengths of the program. Most of the criticisms of the program referred to the lack or insufficiency of practical applicability of the aspect criticized.

This issue of practicality also seems to be one of the major dimensions that differentiated the evaluations of people in the elementary and the secondary programs. Not only did the secondary group criticize the program for its excessively theoretical orientation less frequently than did the elementary group, but it also praised the program more frequently for the specific characteristic of emphasizing practicalities over unessentials. The nature of the tasks demanded of the elementary school teacher were considerably more varied and much more removed from his most recent classroom experience as a student. This seemed to account, at least partially, for their repetitive, insistent pleas for covering more of the specific duties involved in teaching students of an age and ability range with which they have little familiarity and more of the extra-teaching duties (clerical, daily routines) that deluged the new teacher and frustrated his efforts to concentrate on his major function of teaching.

Suggestions

Many of the participants seized the opportunity presented by the questionnaire not only to voice their opinions but also to offer suggestions for changes in future Intensive Teacher Training Programs.

One earnest, specific offer came from several people who thought that one of the most valuable additions to the program would be to include veterans of the first ITTP to talk to current trainees about their own experiences as they went through the program--through their most important first day and first year --the disappointments, frustrations, and gratifications involved throughout their training and teaching experiences. Those who made this suggestion volunteered their own services for this role, which they viewed as one of the best methods of correcting the serious defects of the program regarding insufficient preparation for the realities of the classroom and of lessening the initial anxiety of future trainees.

Some trainees offered suggestions aimed at correcting the reported weakness, expressed particularly by the elementary group, that the training was not practical enough and that preparation for the specific aspects of their teaching and non-teaching assignments was inadequate. One suggestion that would seem to warrant serious consideration is that elementary trainees be assigned to specific grade levels before the beginning of the training program so that their subsequent course work during the summer session can be specialization in the behavior and learning capacities of children at that grade level and in the curriculum and teaching methods appropriate to it. Such a revision in the program was seen as having a number of potential benefits; meaningfully delimiting the course content so that it is directly applicable to the work of the beginning teacher, enabling those who are so inclined to supplement their course study with individual reading geared to their specific area of preparation, diminishing somewhat, by decreasing the degree of initial unfamiliarity, the stress experienced by many of the trainees in their first few months on the job.

In regard to the numerous complaints about insufficient preparation for non-teaching duties, such as clerical chores and lesson-planning, one elementary school teacher set these into the perspective of their importance in clearing the way for coping with other more important problems:

> "Once routines are established and lessons are adequately planned, discipline problems are reduced to a bare minimum."

Thus, coverage of the teachers' daily routines and clerical tasks was seen not as a frill in a teacher-training program but as an essential part of it.

Other suggestions were in relation to correcting for the absence of student teaching. Some simply said it must be included in a teacher-training program. Others, somewhat more responsive to the limitations imposed by a six-week program, offered ideas for small-scale student-teaching or substitute experiences to be incorporated into the program: a week of observations in summer schools, workshops focusing on most probable, as well as possibly deviational, classroom situations and suggestions for handling them, role-playing of classroom experiences by the trainees, film showings of classes that would be representative of the ones to which they would be assigned.

One trainee gave a constructive summary of his suggestions:

> "I will list what I feel now would be a more effective program, i.e., six weeks of observation in a classroom, student teaching for six weeks. A course in routines and discipline. The child psychology course would be more useful if given after we have begun teaching, and especially now, a second six-week program for the second summer. The workshops, etc., offered during the school year were too much to take on after a day of teaching plus home responsibilities. I feel that after a year of teaching I could make some use of curriculum and methods courses."

For those trainees who said the program was too short, there were those who said it was too long; for those who praised the quality of instruction, there were those who denounced it. At least two factors seemed to come into play: 1) the trainees' personal values and attitudes and 2) the unevenness of quality that is inevitable in any institution. Undoubtedly, some instructors were better than others. Some apparently saw their major contribution to lie in giving the trainees the opportunity to benefit in a very practical way from their own direct personal experiences in the classroom; others seemed to have spoken from textbooks rather than from personal experience. Some taught lesson-planning and gave suggestions for motivating a class; others did not. In those reports of weaknesses that seem to reflect the uneven qualities of the program, we were offered directions for possible modifications: continue the policy of recruiting instructors who are currently classroom teachers (in favor of school administrators and college faculty members except perhaps the instructors of the psychology courses). All instructors should be made aware of the need for strong practical emphasis in their teaching. They should be asked to include instruction in lesson-planning and practice in lesson-giving, descriptions of clerical tasks and of daily routines. If the trainees in those classes that were fortunate enough to have had one or two visits to actual classrooms considered that limited exposure to be of such a great help in leveling their expectations, then making this feature universal for all classes in such a program would seem imperative. Possibilities for extending the number of such school visits should certainly be considered.

Regarding the first kind of report, that which reflects value judgments of different kinds of people or specific concerns of particular individuals, one might say that the significance of these opinions especially must be considered in their own right, not in terms of whether they were canceled out by opposing opinions or minimized by infrequent mention.

For example, there were the 17 per cent of the trainees who expressed so vigorously their evaluation of the program as not presenting an accurate picture of the kinds of problems they would meet and therefore leaving them unprepared to handle them. Their indictments were not made less serious because there were other participants who felt more prepared or who considered the program's orientation to be essentially practical or realistic. Attention in any future program must certainly be directed toward developing and utilizing throughout the entire program all possible means for presenting the trainees' future work situations as realistically as possible.

There are other reports that were made by a very small number of participants, yet which demanded immediate corrective action. Of particular importance would seem to be the administrative items in Table 32. Some trainees expressed considerable confusion, disappointment, and resentment regarding the absence of a clear statement by the administrators of the program regarding academic requirements for the program and for licensing. They were also distressed to see that the program made no provisions to take the trainees beyond the initial summer and fall, and that they were limited in making their own arrangements for continuing their professional education, since only The City College had been accepting ITTP credits.

The investigators believe that there is much of value for future administrators in the opinions of the program by the first group of trainees. Here is feedback upon which administrators can shape possible future programs. Attention is directed to those specific elements of the training program that were found most valuable in the teaching experiences of the participants and therefore should be considered for continuation and strengthening. Indications of those aspects of the program that were found to be of little value and were recommended for elimination are also available. Those opinions that relate to faulty overall orientation and policy-making suggest specific areas for thinking and development of solutions.

The Instructors' Opinions

The instructors in the elementary and secondary divisions of the ITTP were asked for their opinions about what should be added to or omitted from the program. Table 33 indicates the suggestions offered by instructors in both groups and the number of instructors making each suggestion. Tables 34 and 35 list additional suggestions offered by instructors only in the elementary or the secondary divisions.

The most frequently made recommendation by both groups of instructors was in regard to the absence of and necessity for student-teaching experience. Several of the other comments were related to student-teaching experience: have an internship in the fall, include workshops in the summer program, have visits to community agencies. Sixty per cent of the instructor group as a whole made this recommendation, but a considerably larger number of secondary instructors than elementary instructors expressed concern for the necessity of student teaching.

Table 33

Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by Elementary and Secondary Level ITTP Instructors

	Elementary		Secondary		Total	
	N = 70		N = 54		N = 124	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Include actual experiences with children in a classroom:	30	42.8	45	83.3	75	60.5
a. opportunity for some student teaching practice						
b. visits to ongoing summer schools or special projects such as Head Start						
2. Eliminate the large, long group sessions in the auditorium	39	55.7	29	53.7	68	54.8
3. Improve coordination in instructor teams: more time for meetings before and during term; members should submit plans to leaders; more time for planning; reduce time needed for clerical and monitorial tasks	10	14.3	3	5.6	13	10.5
4. Have a student-teaching or internship program the following fall	12	17.1	3	5.6	15	12.1
5. Eliminate the Developmental Psychology course (because of its theoretical approach) or change it to have more practical value	10	14.3	4	7.4	14	11.3
6. Include workshops to focus on practical application of psychological and pedagogical principles	7	10.0	8	14.8	15	12.1
7. Eliminate exams	3	4.3	7	13.0	10	8.1
8. Supply students with instructional materials used in schools: bulletins, forms, books, film, etc.	12	17.1	2	3.7	14	11.3
9. Longer class periods	4	5.7	5	9.2	9	7.2

	Elementary N = 70		Secondary N = 54		Total N = 124	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
10. More instruction in methods of teaching	2	2.8	3	5.6	5	4.0
11. Improve required readings (suggestion: have no more than one text per course)	2	2.8	1	1.8	3	2.4
12. Flexibility in class attendance--classes to alternate with small group and individual conferences	2	2.8	1	1.8	3	2.4
13. Visits to community agencies connected with education	1	1.4	1	1.8	2	1.6

Table 34

Additional Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by Elementary Level ITTP Instructors

---

1. More clerical aid for the instructor
2. Eliminate the multiple salary scale
3. Exclude instructors who are not in direct contact with the situation in New York City schools
4. Reduce the number of topics to be included in the course outline for the six-week training period
5. Expose students to extra-teaching aspects of the job--field trips, parent interviews
6. Classes should have less lecturing, more project-type assignments--outside readings, reports, panel discussions
7. Include a course in classroom discipline
8. More attention to the Board of Education bulletins than to texts
9. Better screening and assigning of students to different levels of instruction corresponding to educational background and experience
10. Include a special orientation meeting for students who have been out of college for many years
11. Greater emphasis on teaching of students for whom English is a second language
12. Spend more time on problems peculiar to teaching in a slum school
13. Have specialists in curriculum areas as resource consultants and as guest lecturers
14. Instructors should submit evaluations of students regarding attitudes and personal characteristics that might be unsuitable to the profession
15. Atmosphere of program should be changed from Board of Education in-service type to that of a graduate level program (students at times felt "talked down to"; repetitious announcements and interruptions)

Table 35

Additional Suggestions for Changes in the ITTP Submitted by

Secondary Level ITTP Instructors

---

1. Include instruction in the practical routines of the teacher
2. Distribute outlines to accompany the large group lectures
3. Have smaller classes
4. Improve the criteria for selection of students
5. Improve the library facilities

The second most frequently made recommendation was in regard to the elimination of the auditorium lectures. These were generally viewed as containing non-essential content, with the time potentially much better spent in class units.

Both the instructor group and the trainee group seemed to be similarly concerned for the inclusion of student teaching and related experience and the elimination of the auditorium sessions. There were other instructor recommendations that also found expression in the student reactions: eliminate the psychology course or change its orientation to one that is more practical, eliminate exams, expose students to the kinds of instructional materials used in schools, increase the emphasis on methods of teaching. One suggestion relevant only to the instructors was the call for improved coordination within instructor teams.

In the list of additional suggestions made separately by the elementary and by the secondary level instructors, there was further reinforcement of many of the trainees' recommendations. First, there are suggestions related to improving preparation for the specific school situation the trainees would be most likely to face: exclude instructors who are not directly familiar with the New York City classroom situation, include a course in classroom discipline, increase the emphasis on teaching students for whom English is a second language, spend more time on problems peculiar to teaching in a slum school. Second, there are suggestions related to course administration: reduce the number of topics to be covered in the short period of the program, include in the course content exposure to practical routines and extra-teaching aspects of the job, emphasize

Board of Education manuals more than textbooks, include curriculum specialists as consultants and as guest lecturers, change the tone of the classroom atmosphere from an in-service variety to that of graduate work. Third, there are suggestions related to the screening of trainees--for assignment to courses in the training program itself as well as for recommendation for assuming teaching responsibilities based on an evaluation of their personal characteristics.

Recommendations made by the instructors that were not made by the trainees as well were as follows: lecturing should be de-emphasized in class work and project-type assignments should be increased, a special orientation meeting should be instituted for students out of college for many years, outlines should be distributed for the auditorium lectures, and library facilities should be improved.

Suggestions concerning only the instructors were that more clerical aid should be available to them and that their salaries should be uniform rather than on a multiple scale.

* * *

Generally speaking, both the instructors and the trainees who were involved in this first ITTP seemed to see the program as one that served an important enough function and had enough basic strengths to warrant serious consideration of their suggestions for correcting its numerous but largely remediable weaknesses.

CHAPTER VII

SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING

The trainees had been asked to evaluate their courses at the end of the summer session. Because of the small variation in the replies, the evaluation was repeated again after the trainees had experienced one full semester of teaching.

On March 3, 1967, each trainee who had registered for the fall seminar and who had accepted a full-time teaching assignment was mailed Inventory IV,[1] a 39-item questionnaire concerning their attitudes and satisfactions with their beginning teaching experience. The questionnaire was mailed along with Inventory V,[2] an open-ended questionnaire requesting opinions about the summer and fall programs, which was discussed in Chapter VI.

A total of 1,040 Inventory IV's were returned by May 15, 1967, the cut-off date. This represented a sample of 63.3 per cent of those trainees who had been sent the questionnaire. A sample as small as the above could be biased toward those who were more satisfied with the program and should not be accepted as representative of the entire group. The results assessed here are representative only of the 1,040 who answered the questionnaire.

The first 28 items offered three choices, one positive, one negative and one neutral. The next 11 asked the trainees to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of their work on a four-point scale. The number and per cent answering the choices of each item of the inventory are listed in Table 36.

Teaching Experience

Seven items related to beginning teaching experience: items 1, 4, 7, 17, 19, 26, and 28. Most of these items were answered positively. Seventy-five per cent felt that the contributions they made to class activity as a whole were helpful. Eighty-eight per cent felt that the skills they learned during their first year would be of value to their future teaching performance. Seventy-three per cent said that their plans for using methods and materials were employed often enough. Fifty-eight per cent found their teaching experience challenging and interesting. Only 45 per cent satisfactorily attained the goals toward which they were striving. Forty-one per cent were discouraged with what

---

[1] See Inventory IV, Appendix B.

[2] See Inventory V, Appendix B.

Table 36

Opinions about Beginning Teaching Experiences

	N	%
1. I feel that the contributions I made to the class activity as a whole:		
1. were not usually very effective.	125	12
2. were constructive and helpful.	780	75
3. were too infrequent to be effective.	114	11
4. no answer.	21	2
2. In general, I thought the behavior of the pupils I taught was:		
1. too subdued.	21	2
2. too rowdy.	530	51
3. satisfactory.	468	45
4. no answer.	21	2
3. The comments made by my supervisors regarding my mistakes were:		
1. just critical enough to be helpful.	707	68
2. overly critical.	94	9
3. not critical enough.	198	19
4. no answer.	41	4
4. My teaching experience left me with a feeling that teaching is:		
1. somewhat unorganized.	281	27
2. very challenging and interesting.	603	58
3. a little too routine.	114	11
4. no answer.	42	4
5. When discussing my teaching performance with me, my supervisor was:		
1. too critical.	73	7
2. not critical enough.	218	21
3. just critical enough.	697	67
4. no answer.	52	5
6. The intelligence level of most of the pupils I taught:		
1. was lower than I would have liked.	707	68
2. was just about what I like to have.	302	29
3. was higher than I would have liked.	10	1
4. no answer.	21	2

	N	%
7. A comparison of what I strived for and what I attained in teaching my pupils made me:		
1. feel that I may have expected too much of myself.	187	18
2. feel a sense of accomplishment.	395	38
3. feel a bit discouraged.	427	41
4. no answer.	31	3
8. In preparing me to become a member of the teaching profession, this experience has left me with a feeling of being:		
1. unqualified to be a teacher.	52	5
2. barely prepared to teach in the schools.	374	36
3. adequately prepared to teach in the schools.	593	57
4. no answer.	21	2
9. My personal relationships with staff members at the school.		
1. were very pleasant and cordial.	863	83
2. were distant and impersonal.	73	7
3. were somewhat unsatisfying.	83	8
4. no answer.	21	2
10. My supervisors' interest in my professional improvement and growth was:		
1. somewhat superficial.	333	32
2. sincere and helpful.	655	63
3. intensive to the point of being annoying.	31	3
4. no answer.	21	2
11. The regulations to which I had to conform seemed:		
1. unnecessary in many respects.	333	32
2. rather vague but not unreasonable.	281	27
3. reasonable and agreeable to me.	426	41
4. no answer.	0	0
12. The assignments given to me by my supervisors:		
1. were about as varied as they should be.	686	66
2. were too varied to learn any one aspect of teaching.	104	10
3. were not varied enough to broaden my experience.	187	18
4. no answer.	63	6

	N	%
13. In discussions with my supervisors my viewpoint:		
1. was accepted too often without adequate understanding.	125	12
2. was accepted and understood practically all of the time.	655	63
3. was seldom accepted.	177	17
4. no answer.	83	8
14. My own plans for using methods and materials:		
1. were accepted a little too often.	94	9
2. were employed often enough.	759	73
3. were not employed often enough.	135	13
4. no answer.	52	5
15. The pupils I had in my class:		
1. seemed indifferent to school activities.	375	36
2. mildly resisted my attempts to teach them.	395	38
3. were easily motivated.	218	21
4. no answer.	52	5
16. The amount of clerical work given to me was:		
1. too little for me to learn this aspect of the teaching job.	63	6
2. appropriate and helpful.	218	21
3. a little more than I considered necessary.	738	71
4. no answer.	21	2
17. As I evaluate my ITTP experience in light of my other college work, I am convinced that it:		
1. was one of my least valuable courses.	281	27
2. was the most valuable course I have taken.	166	16
3. was about as valuable as my other college courses.	572	55
4. no answer.	21	2
18. My supervisor's suggestions were:		
1. of little help to me.	198	19
2. too demanding of my time.	62	6
3. reasonable and helpful.	728	70
4. no answer.	52	5
19. This first teaching experience gave me a feeling of:		
1. personal inadequacy in some respects.	187	18
2. achievement and personal satisfaction.	354	34
3. discouragement with the gap between educational theory and practice.	426	41
4. no answer.	73	7

	N	%
20. In general, the atmosphere of the school to which I was assigned was:		
1. too easygoing for maximum learning by children.	260	25
2. about as democratic as it should be.	572	55
3. overly dominated by the administration.	166	16
4. no answer.	42	4
21. I found that my personal relationships with school personnel prompted me to:		
1. just coast along until the end of the semester.	198	19
2. consider postponement of my teaching career.	73	7
3. put forth a great deal of effort.	707	68
4. no answer.	62	6
22. Ideally I would like to teach pupils whose socio-economic background is:		
1. lower than the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.	31	3
2. about the same as the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.	530	51
3. higher than the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.	437	42
4. no answer.	42	4
23. My fall ITTP classwork:		
1. was proportioned according to the amount of time I had available.	801	77
2. was not too considerate of the amount of work I had to do in teaching.	104	10
3. did not require enough time to keep me busy.	104	10
4. no answer.	31	3
24. The methods of teaching adhered to by my supervisors:		
1. were too subject-centered to meet the needs of enough children.	329	22
2. were too child-centered to effectively teach the necessary subject matter.	135	13
3. were appropriate for obtaining the desired pupil growth.	603	58
4. no answer.	73	7
25. When planning classroom activities, my supervisors:		
1. sometimes assigned the planning to me but often ignored my efforts.	135	13
2. usually had me participate in the planning with them.	624	60
3. seldom gave me a chance to participate in the planning.	125	12
4. no answer.	156	15

	N	%
26. The goals toward which I was striving in my teaching:		
1. were generally attained to my satisfaction.	468	45
2. were seldom attained to my satisfaction.	323	31
3. were probably not appropriate to the pupils I taught.	218	21
4. no answer.	31	3
27. The kinds of activities in which pupils in my class participated:		
1. were too routine to stimulate the interest of the children.	167	16
2. were about like those I desired.	582	56
3. were lacking in purpose and meaning for most of the children.	239	23
4. no answer.	52	5
28. The skills I learned during my first year teaching:		
1. should be of enormous value to my future teaching performance.	915	88
2. will probably be unimportant to my future teaching performance.	21	2
3. were actually too few in number to affect my future teaching.	83	8
4. no answer.	21	2

How would you rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your work?

		Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Very Dissatisfied		No Answer	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
29.	salary	31	3	354	34	375	36	270	26	10	1
30.	teaching load	62	6	686	66	208	20	63	6	21	2
31.	respect and recognition from community	177	17	634	61	146	14	73	7	10	1
32.	respect and recognition from superiors	219	21	634	61	135	13	52	5	0	0
33.	relations with pupils	302	29	541	52	156	15	31	3	10	1
34.	relations with parents	167	16	603	58	166	16	62	6	42	4
35.	supervisory assistance	209	20	478	46	208	20	135	13	10	1
36.	intellectual stimulation	114	11	489	47	281	27	135	13	21	2
37.	teaching materials	114	11	489	47	291	28	125	12	21	2
38.	class size	104	10	333	32	437	42	135	13	31	3
39.	extra class duties	74	7	551	53	270	26	135	13	10	1

they achieved and the same per cent was discouraged with the gap between educational theory and practice.

Preparation

Three items dealt with preparation: items 8, 17, and 23. Seventy-seven per cent said that their fall ITTP classwork was not overly time-consuming. Fifty-seven per cent reported that the experience left them adequately prepared to teach in the schools. Fifty-five per cent of the sample rated the ITTP courses about as valuable as other college courses.

Supervision

The inventory had eight items dealing with supervision: items 3, 5, 10, 12, 13, 18, 24, and 25. All of these items were answered positively. Seventy per cent felt that their supervisors' suggestions were reasonable and helpful and 68 per cent thought that their supervisors' comments regarding their mistakes were just critical enough to be helpful. Sixty-three per cent believed that their supervisors were sincerely interested in their professional improvement and growth. Fifty-eight per cent approved of the teaching methods adhered to by their supervisors, and 60 per cent reported that they were given a chance to participate in the planning of classroom activities. Fifteen per cent offered no answer to that item.

Pupils

Five items related to pupils: items 2, 6, 15, 22, 27. Only two of these (items 22 and 27) were answered in the positive. Fifty-one per cent were satisfied with teaching children of a lower socio-economic background. Fifty-six per cent were satisfied with the kinds of classroom activities in which the pupils participated, considering them neither too dull nor meaningless for most of the children. Sixty-eight per cent thought that the intelligence level of the pupils they taught was too low. Fifty-one per cent said that pupils were too rowdy and 74 per cent felt that their pupils were either indifferent or not easily motivated.

Staff

Two items were related to the school staff: items 9 and 21. Eighty-three per cent found the staff members to be pleasant and cordial and 68 per cent found that their personal relationships with school personnel prompted them to put forth a great deal of effort.

Duties

Two items concerned duties: items 11 and 16. Only 41 per cent felt that the regulations to which they had to conform were reasonable. Thirty-two per cent found them unnecessary. Seventy-one per cent felt that more clerical work was assigned than they felt necessary.

Climate

One item, item 20, related to school climate. Fifty-five per cent reported that the atmosphere of the assigned school was about as democratic as it should be.

Satisfactions

When asked to rate 11 aspects of their work from very satisfied to very dissatisfied, all but two items had a majority on the positive side. The two with the majority on the negative side were salary with 62 per cent dissatisfied, and class size with 55 per cent dissatisfied. The highest satisfactions were in respect and recognition from superiors, 82 per cent, relations with pupils, 81 per cent, respect and recognition from the community, 78 per cent, and relations with parents, 74 per cent.

CHAPTER VIII

PRINCIPALS' EVALUATIONS

Midway in the second semester (March 23, 1967) a questionnaire was sent to the principal of each trainee assigned to a public school. (Appendix B) The principals were asked to respond to 13 items relating to their impressions and observations of each trainee on a separate form. They were asked to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the trainee in comparison with regular beginning teachers. In addition, they were asked to rate the difficulty of the teacher's assignment. The name of the trainee was not to be reported and the form was to be returned to the Office of Personnel.

It must be remembered that the trainees were assigned as permanent substitutes to fill vacancies that otherwise could have been staffed only on a day-to-day basis. Under these circumstances, it seems probable that a trainee would have to have been rated below the average per diem substitute in order to have been given an unsatisfactory rating. Thus, although the principals were requested to make their comparisons with regularly appointed beginning teachers, it is open to question as to whether some of them may have used a more lenient basis for comparison.

Because of the nature of the non-public school program and the fact that the teachers assigned to it were being evaluated by another agency,[1] the questionnaires were not sent to the non-public school principals. The 127 trainees who were in the non-public schools were not observed at any time by their principals and answered only to the supervisors from the New York City Board of Education. They also received special weekly training in remedial reading or remedial arithmetic.

The 53 trainees assigned to district offices were also not included because the nature of their appointment was not typical of that of a regular teacher and thus, offered no basis for comparison.

Principal's ratings were received for 1,227 teacher trainees. This represented 87.5 per cent of the 1,403 who were then teaching full-time in the public schools.

---

[1] The non-public school Title I program was being evaluated by The Center for Urban Education. (See Chapter V)

Principals' Ratings

When principals were asked to compare the performance of the trainees with that of regular beginning teachers, 72.6 per cent were rated as average, above average or excellent. Table 37 presents a distribution of these ratings. Nine per cent of the total group were rated as unsatisfactory, 18.4 per cent as below average, 38.1 per cent as average, 26.8 per cent as above average and 7.7 per cent as excellent.

In general, trainees in high schools tended to be rated higher than those assigned to elementary, junior high, and intermediate schools. While 9.1 per cent of the elementary and 9.5 per cent of the junior high school trainees were rated as unsatisfactory, only 6.0 per cent of the senior high school trainees were so rated. Also, 31.7 per cent of the elementary and 38.3 per cent of the junior high school trainees were rated above average or excellent, in comparison with 43.0 per cent of the senior high school trainees. This difference was partially explained by the principals' ratings of assignment difficulty.

Difficulty of Assigment

The principals rated 52.3 per cent of the elementary and 50.5 per cent of the junior high school assignments as difficult or very difficult, but only 21.0 per cent of the senior high school assignments were rated as such. In the opinion of the principals, the elementary and junior high school trainees tended

Table 37

Principals' Ratings of Teaching Competence

Rating	Elementary		JHS		HS		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory	71	9.1	33	9.5	6	6.0	110	9.0
Below Average	152	19.5	59	17.0	15	15.0	226	18.4
Average	310	39.7	122	35.2	36	36.0	468	38.1
Above Average	185	23.7	110	31.7	34	34.0	329	26.8
Excellent	62	8.0	23	6.6	9	9.0	94	7.7
Total	780		347		100		1,227	

to receive the more difficult assignments. Table 38 presents a distribution of the principals' ratings of assignment difficulty.

Table 38

Principals' Ratings of Assignment

Rating	Elementary		JHS		HS		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Average	366	46.9	168	48.4	75	75.0	609	49.6
Difficult	339	43.5	163	47.0	19	19.0	521	42.5
Very Difficult	69	8.8	12	3.5	2	2.0	83	6.8
No Answer	6	0.8	4	1.1	4	4.0	14	1.1
Total	780		347		100		1,227	

Reappointment

The principals had the option of terminating the appointment of the trainee or requesting reassignment at the end of the first semester. Of the 1,227 trainees for whom replies were received from the principals, 1,035 or 84.3 per cent were reappointed to the same position for the second semester. Table 39 presents a distribution of reappointments, categorized by principals' ratings of competence.

Table 39

Second Semester Appointments to Same Assignments

Rating	Reappointed		Not Reappointed	
	N	%	N	%
Unsatisfactory	34	30.9	76	69.1
Below Average	159	70.4	67	29.6
Average	432	92.3	36	7.7
Above Average	319	97.0	10	3.0
Excellent	91	96.8	3	3.2
Total	1,035		192	

Only 30.9 per cent of those rated unsatisfactory were reappointed to the same position in contrast to 70.4 per cent of those rated below average, 92.3 per cent rated average, 97.0 per cent rated above average, and 96.3 per cent rated excellent. In the case of the three trainees rated excellent who were not reappointed, two voluntarily withdrew from the program at the end of the first semester and one was transferred because of the return of a regular teacher from maternity leave.

Principals' Opinions and Observations

The principals were asked to describe the performance of each trainee in response to thirteen items based upon his opinion and observation. He was asked to respond to each item by answering "yes," or "no," or "no opportunity to observe." Table 40 presents an analysis of the principals' responses to each of the thirteen items.

In the case of each of the 13 items, those rated as unsatisfactory had the lowest per cent of "yes" answers. This per cent grew progressively larger as the rating approached excellent.

On such items as item 2 ("is getting good results with pupils"), item 3 ("shows a positive influence on pupils"), item 4 ("organizes work well"), and item 13 ("has exhibited growth on the job"), those rated unsatisfactory received a rating of "yes" 0 per cent, 0.9 per cent, 4.5 per cent and 9.1 per cent respectively. In contrast, every one of those rated excellent received a "yes" rating to those items.

One question did not relate to the performance of the teacher. This was item 9 ("Did the teacher attend the after-school workshop?). Registration in the workshop was voluntary, but available to each trainee. It is of interest to note that 24.5 per cent of those rated as unsatisfactory, 37.6 per cent of those rated below average, 35.4 per cent average, 52.9 per cent rated above average and 67.0 per cent rated excellent took advantage of these workshops. Without attempting to imply a cause and effect relationship, it should be pointed out that those trainees who received an above average or excellent rating made wider use of the after-school workshops. It is possible that the workshops increased the efficiency of the trainee; however, it is also probable that the most professionally minded trainees were more likely to take advantage of the workshops.

Table 40

Principals' Opinions and Observations of Trainees

Rating	Yes		No		No Opportunity to Observe	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Knows the subject (in his major teaching assignment) well enough to teach it.						
Unsatisfactory	33	30.0	73	66.4	4	3.6
Below Average	136	60.2	72	31.9	18	7.9
Average	432	92.3	19	4.1	17	3.6
Above Average	321	97.6	4	1.2	4	1.2
Excellent	91	96.8	0	0.0	3	3.2
2. Is getting good results with his pupils.						
Unsatisfactory	0	0.0	107	97.3	3	2.7
Below Average	19	8.4	184	81.4	23	10.2
Average	376	80.4	52	11.1	40	8.5
Above Average	325	98.8	1	0.3	3	0.9
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3. Shows a positive influence on pupils in developing character, citizenship, and positive attitudes.						
Unsatisfactory	1	0.9	107	97.3	2	1.8
Below Average	44	19.5	155	68.6	27	11.9
Average	372	79.5	43	9.2	53	11.3
Above Average	324	98.5	0	0.0	5	1.5
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4. Organizes the work well.						
Unsatisfactory	5	4.5	101	91.9	4	3.6
Below Average	40	17.7	167	73.9	19	8.4
Average	350	74.8	101	21.6	17	3.6
Above Average	320	97.3	6	1.8	3	0.9
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5. Is enthusiastic and conscientious about his work.						
Unsatisfactory	28	25.5	77	70.0	5	4.5
Below Average	122	54.0	81	35.8	23	10.2
Average	430	91.9	25	5.3	13	2.8
Above Average	328	99.7	1	0.3	0	0.0
Excellent	93	98.9	1	1.1	0	0.0
6. Has a stable, well-adjusted personality.						
Unsatisfactory	23	20.9	81	73.6	6	5.5
Below Average	131	58.0	68	30.1	27	11.9
Average	442	94.5	16	3.4	10	2.1
Above Average	328	99.7	0	0.0	1	0.3
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Rating	Yes		No		No Opportunity to Observe	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
7. Is mature.						
Unsatisfactory	30	27.3	75	68.2	5	4.5
Below Average	141	62.4	69	30.5	16	7.1
Average	423	90.4	35	7.5	10	2.1
Above Average	324	98.5	3	0.9	2	0.6
Excellent	93	98.9	0	0.0	1	1.1
8. Has a good attitude toward supervision.						
Unsatisfactory	36	32.7	71	64.6	3	2.7
Below Average	154	68.1	61	27.0	11	4.9
Average	425	90.8	33	7.1	10	2.1
Above Average	323	98.2	5	1.5	1	0.3
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9. Takes part in the after-school workshop program.						
Unsatisfactory	27	24.5	71	64.6	12	10.9
Below Average	85	37.6	126	55.8	15	6.6
Average	166	35.4	245	52.4	57	12.2
Above Average	174	52.9	119	36.2	36	10.9
Excellent	63	67.0	22	23.4	9	9.6
10. Is a loyal staff member.						
Unsatisfactory	61	55.5	36	32.7	13	11.8
Below Average	171	75.7	26	11.5	29	12.8
Average	441	94.2	11	2.4	16	3.4
Above Average	325	98.8	2	0.6	2	0.6
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Fits into the school staff well; is liked by other teachers.						
Unsatisfactory	39	35.5	55	50.0	16	14.5
Below Average	141	62.4	45	19.9	40	17.7
Average	435	93.0	13	2.8	20	4.2
Above Average	324	98.5	2	0.6	3	0.9
Excellent	93	98.9	0	0.0	1	1.1
12. Is liked by pupils.						
Unsatisfactory	29	26.4	67	60.9	14	12.7
Below Average	141	62.4	52	23.0	33	14.6
Average	394	84.2	26	5.6	48	10.2
Above Average	327	99.4	0	0.0	2	0.6
Excellent	93	98.9	0	0.0	1	1.1

Rating	Yes N	Yes %	No N	No %	No Opportunity to Observe N	No Opportunity to Observe %
13. Has exhibited growth on the job.						
Unsatisfactory	10	9.1	94	85.5	6	5.4
Below Average	125	55.3	85	37.6	16	7.1
Average	430	91.8	19	4.1	19	4.1
Above Average	327	99.4	2	0.6	0	0.0
Excellent	94	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

N = 1,227

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

1. The Intensive Teacher Training Program recruited college graduates who had neither courses in education nor supervised teaching in their college programs. Of the 3,400 candidates notified of acceptance to the program, 2,100 entered and 1,858 successfully completed the summer course of study. A total of 1,629 attended the fall seminars, in which 1,492 received a passing grade. As of May 15, 1967, 1,583 were still holding full-time assignments.

2. The program recruited a slightly larger per cent of men than of women. The men tended to be younger. Forty-three per cent of the trainees had received their baccalaureate degrees in the month prior to the program. Less then one-third had received degrees prior to 1960. The majority of trainees were native to New York City and had attended college there.

3. Due to the persuasive efforts of the Office of Personnel, a large number of men who wanted secondary assignments were diverted into elementary school teaching.

4. The opinions of the trainees emphasized the need for practicality in the training program and the great desirability of some form of student teaching. This was also stressed by the instructors.

5. Many of the trainees were critical of the assignments they were given and of the pupils they had to teach.

6. The principals rated only nine per cent of the trainees as unsatisfactory, and rated 72.6 per cent as average or above, as compared with other new teachers.

7. The principals rated 52.3 per cent of the elementary school assignments, 50.5 per cent of the junior high, and 21.0 per cent of the high school assignments as difficult or very difficult.

Additional Highlights

1. **The recruitment campaign was unique. Publicity about the program was disseminated throughout the nation. The response of more than 20,000 inquiries was far above that of any known previous recruitment campaign.**
2. **The great majority of applicants were college graduates who were native to New York City and thus aware of the problems inherent to an urban situation.**
3. **One of the most significant contributions of the program was the diversion of an unusually large number of males into the elementary classrooms. This would not have been possible without the special effort put forth by the Office of Personnel.**
4. **Another significant contribution was the recruitment of a large number of mature women whose children were grown or of school age.**
5. **The cooperation between the Board of Education and The City College, not only in the training stage, but also in the planning and throughout the beginning teaching period of the trainees, was an innovation which could have wide implications for further teacher-training programs.**
6. **The program offered the opportunity for a large number of public school personnel to be involved in the college teaching process.**
7. **Because of the large number of inexperienced teachers entering the school system at one time, the Board of Education** expedited the preparation of man**uals for beginning teachers and for the supervisors of beginning teachers. These manuals should be of value to future teachers entering the system.**
8. **The after-school workshops, inaugurated chiefly because of the project, allowed each school to set up a program of in-service training for new teachers based upon the specific needs of the individual school. These workshops were staffed with experienced teachers and administrators and were beneficial to other staff as well as the trainees.**
9. **The Intensive Teacher Training Program was responsible for adding 1,558 teachers to the New York City Public School roster. Without the program, many** activities would necessarily have been curtailed and emergency measures such as consolidating classes and increasing class size would have been necessary in many schools.

Discussion

Evaluation of Competence

No effort was made to compare the competence of the trainees with that of beginning teachers, trained under regular programs and given the same pattern of in-service training. Help and supervision for the ITTP teachers was far in advance of what new teachers ordinarily receive. Such a comparison would require a carefully designed study with strict controls.

It must be pointed out that the present assessment of the program in no way attempts to make a comparison between the Intensive Teacher Training Program and regular programs of preparing teachers, or of the quality of work that graduates of regular teacher-education programs might achieve if they were treated in a similar fashion during their first year of teaching.

Meeting the Emergency

The trainees were all college graduates who presented evidence of competence in their subject matter fields and had successfully passed the examination requirements set forth by the New York City Board of Examiners, although they were lacking in education courses. Two-thirds of the teachers received competence ratings from their principals of average or better when compared with regular beginning teachers.

In light of these results, the program must be judged a success in that it did help to meet the emergency shortage of teachers. Since the primary objective was to recruit and hold as many trainees as possible, the addition of ~~1,558 full~~-time teachers met 52 per cent of the anticipated teacher need of the New York City Public Schools.

A total of 1,492 trainees will be eligible for permanent substitute licenses in Fall, 1967.

Possible Long-Range Effects

Until it is known how many will actually apply for these licenses and accept full-time appointments for the 1967-68 school year, a complete assessment of the above objective cannot be made. For example, 78 trainees had just completed law degrees. Will they continue in teaching, or was entrance into the program a method of obtaining employment while preparing for the state bar examination? All of the trainees signed an agreement to teach for one year. What effect did the agreement have on the relatively small per cent of drop-outs? How many will return in September cannot be judged in June.

The fall seminars offered a forum for the discussion of common problems and a chance for the trainees to feel themselves part of a common group. Will this esprit de corps remain now that they no longer meet together in classes at City College? Throughout the past year they were treated as part of a special group engaged in an experiment of interest to both City College and the New York City Board of Education. What effect did this have on the success of the past year? How many of the trainees will continue to register for education courses leading to the master's degree and a regular teaching license? These questions can only be answered by future longitudinal study.

The demographic background of the trainees raises several questions. Forty-three per cent of the trainees had received their baccalaureate degrees in the month immediately prior to the program. Would it not have been more advisable for these people to have entered directly into a graduate program in education? Sixty-four per cent of the men were below 25 years of age and 31 per cent reported no previous full-time employment other than student. Did the program offer a sub-standard short-cut into a steady job?

If the program were to become a continuing part of the New York City public school recruitment procedure, what effects would it have upon the colleges which are offering regular teacher-training programs? The summer school graduate education registration at The City University of New York fell from 6,442 in 1965 to 6,158 in 1966, the summer of The City College Intensive Teacher Training Program.[1] In the spring of 1967, the number of education graduate students taking student teaching dropped 54.1 per cent.[2] At the same time total graduate education registration increased only 3.1 per cent as against a 5.5 per cent increase in the previous year.

It would be presumptuous to imply that the decreases in student teaching and graduate education enrollments are the sole result of the Intensive Teacher Training Program. However, a continuing program of this kind at a time of lagging enrollments in programs of full professional training, could, over a time, presumably have a deleterious effect on enrollment in the regular teacher-education programs.

---

[1] Teacher Education Census, Highlights: Summer 1966, The City University of New York.

[2] Teacher Education Census, Highlights: Spring 1967, The City University of New York.

If a substantial percentage of new teachers are to be obtained through similar programs, what will the long-term effect be on the quality of teaching? Unless the trainees are encouraged or required to contimue their professional training the level of quality will gradually decline.

Recommendations

If the Intensive Teacher Training Program is to be continued or replicated, a number of recommendations based upon the experience of the past year should be explored. Some of these recommendations were anticipated at the beginning or during the project but for reasons of practicality they could not be carried out.

Recruitment

A period of at least three years should be required between the date of the awarding of the baccalaureate degree and the time of entrance into the program. Such a time requirement would discourage those students who would normally enroll in a regular teacher-education program from being attracted by a short-cut approach.

All of the examinations given by the New York City Board of Examiners should be administered, and results made known to the candidates, before the start of the program. Admitting a person to a program and later notifying him that he is ineligible should be eliminated to the extent possible.

The registration and record-keeping procedures should be handled by electronic data processing as far as possible. This would require that registration plans be made well in advance of the start of the program.

Student Teaching

Provision should be made to provide the trainee with some actual contact with pupils. In the elementary program, the only children available were those in such courses as Head Start which were too specialized, and no secondary summer school was in operation within reasonable traveling time from the college. It would be advisable to house the elementary and secondary sessions in school buildings in which summer school programs are being conducted.

If the course of study is too compact to allow for some form of student teaching, some thought should be given to lengthening the duration of the summer program.

In situations where direct student teaching is not possible, some consideration should be given to recent innovations such as micro-teaching or simulation techniques.

Faculty

Although the majority of the faculty were recruited from practical school personnel, too few of the instructors were classroom teachers. Some provision should be made to maintain a better balance between teachers, school administrators and college personnel. Psychology instructors as well as teachers of methods courses should have a realistic acquaintance with school situations and practices.

Teacher Appointments

Many of the trainees received classroom assignments outside of their areas of preparation. Better liaison between the school Department of Personnel and the directors of the program relative to available vacancies could alleviate this problem.

According to the principals, almost half of the trainees received difficult or very difficult assignments. It seems quite undesirable for teachers trained in such a program to be given such initial assignments.

It would be wise to explore a part-time initial assignment or an intern program for the first year of assignment.

Further Study

As this report is completed, near the end of the first year of teaching of the ITTP trainees, it is impossible to foretell what proportion of them will continue in teaching careers. A longitudinal study would be desirable, tracing the professional future of the group. If a large proportion remain in teaching, the success of the program will be enhanced. If, however, a large proportion should drop out after completing the year specified in their contracts, the value of the program would be diminished. Only with further follow-up study can the final evaluation of the program be made.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION MATERIALS

A-1

BOARD OF EDUCATION
of The City of New York
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

THEODORE H. LANG
Deputy Superintendent of Schools

May 9, 1966

TO PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS INTERESTED IN THE CONDITIONAL LICENSE FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHER AND THE SUMMER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Dear Sir or Madam:

This letter and the accompanying explanatory materials are sent in response to your inquiry about the new Conditional License for Substitute Teacher and the Summer Education Program arranged by the Board of Education with The City College School of Education for the summer of 1966.

The Board of Education anticipates the need for approximately 3000 teachers in September 1966 over and beyond the usual number required for replacements. Of this number, approximately two-thirds are needed in the elementary schools and one-third are needed in the junior high and day high schools. It appears necessary, therefore, to recruit at this time all available qualified persons who may be interested in a career as a New York City school teacher. To encourage interested college graduates who lack full professional preparation for teaching, the Board of Education has arranged an intensive summer-training program and has approved the issuance of a Conditional License for Substitute Teacher to holders of the baccalaureate degree who do not have the amount of professional preparation (education courses) usually required of applicants for a substitute's license. For a limited period and under special conditions of examination and preparation, persons in this group may now enter the New York City school system as teachers. This Conditional License may be converted without further fee to the usual substitute license under the following conditions: Completion of one year of satisfactory teaching and by meeting the minimum academic and professional requirements for the usual substitute license.

1. Summer Education Program

So that college graduates who lack the requisite teacher-training courses may qualify for the Conditional License for Substitute Teacher at this time, a Summer Education Program has been planned. This pre-service intensive program has been organized by the Division of Teacher Education of The City University and will be given in The City College School of Education. The courses described in the accompanying Descriptive Circular are designed to give maximum help to prospective teachers entering the New York City school system. Those completing the Summer Education Program successfully will be granted 6 or 8 credits depending on the license area chosen by the applicant.

(Continued on Reverse Side)

The usual tuition and college fees will be paid by the Board of Education for all participants who attend the Summer Education Program at The City College. Also, the Board of Education makes a commitment to offer employment in the New York City schools in September 1966 for a period of one year, and to continue a special orientation and training program. In return, those qualifying for license by this means commit themselves to accept the positions and to serve for the one year period.

2. Materials Enclosed

(a) Explanatory material from the Board of Examiners with an application for examination and return envelope to Board of Examiners.

(b) Statement of commitment for those applying for admission to the "Summer Education Program."

(c) Descriptive Circular "Summer Education Program" giving details of the Teacher-Training Program at The City College School of Education.

(d) Application for admission to The City College and return envelope to The City College.

3. Directions to Applicants Applying for Admission to the Summer Education Program

(a) Fill out the enclosed application for Board of Examiners; fill out commitment form and return both without delay in the return envelope to the Board of Examiners. Be sure to attach fee of $3.00 in the form of check or money order as indicated in directions from Board of Examiners. Applicants for the Summer Education Program who are not admitted to The City College will receive a refund of the fee, upon their application to the Board of Examiners within a reasonable period after receipt of notice. However, should they desire to do so, they may secure their Education credits elsewhere at their own expense and pursue their applications to the Board of Examiners.

(b) Fill out application for admission to The City College and return in the return envelope to The City College.

(c) All materials should be filed by May 31, 1966 if they are to be processed in time for your admission to the examination and to the Summer Education Program. Earlier filing will increase the opportunity for acceptance in the program.

4. Directions to Applicants Not Applying for Admission to the Summer Education Program (Applying for License Only)

The Board of Examiners may receive applications for Conditional License only to June 30, 1966. After that date filing for the usual substitute licenses will resume.

Fill out only application for Board of Examiners and send this without delay in the return envelope to the Board of Examiners. Be sure to attach fee of $3.00 in the form of check or money order as indicated in directions from Board of Examiners. Those already eligible for the Conditional License need take no additional courses during the summer.

(Continued on Next Page)

5. **Evidence of Education**

All applicants should include with their applications to the Board of Examiners copies of student transcript or other evidence of the holding of a baccalaureate degree and/or the completion of appropriate education courses, if these are available. If these are not now available, applications should be filed and the aforementioned evidence should be promptly obtained and held until requested by the Board of Examiners, in order to avoid delay in licensure.

All of the above should be done at the earliest possible time as preparations are now under way for setting up examination schedules and the Summer Education Program.

6. **Salaries**

Teachers with a baccalaureate degree will be paid at the first salary step of the basic schedule, $5,300 per annum. (On October 1, 1966 the schedule increases to $5,400.) Upon completion of a year of satisfactory service (as defined in the Bylaws of the Board of Education) the teacher will be advanced to the second salary step, $5,750 per annum.

Those who offer 30 semester hours of approved courses beyond a baccalaureate degree will be entitled to a differential in salary of $500 per annum above the basic rate. Those who offer 60 semester hours of approved courses beyond the baccalaureate degree will be entitled to a differential in salary of $1,000 per annum above the basic rate. In addition, there is a promotional differential of $1,000 per annum paid to teachers who hold an approved master's degree from a recognized college or university or who have completed the required number of courses in an area of specialization.

We are pleased with your interest in this program and invite your application which will be given the fullest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Theodore H. Lang

Theodore H. Lang
Deputy Superintendent

A-2

LEAVE BLANK FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

ACCEPTED	REJECTED
☐ Bd. of Education ☐ City College Date__________	

Print Name Mr. Mrs. Miss ____________________________________
First Middle Initial Last

Former Name, if any____________________________________

Address____
Number & Street Borough Zip Code

Date of Birth_________________Place of Birth_______________

THE CITY COLLEGE
OF
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Convent Avenue at 138th Street
New York, N. Y. 10031

APPLICATION
for
INTENSIVE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SUMMER- FALL (1966) in COOPERATION WITH THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Instructions for Filing

Filing Dates: Because registration is limited, this application should be filed as soon as possible. All applications will be processed as they are received. All applications should be on file before June 1, 1966.

Transcripts: Official undergraduate and/or graduate transcripts must be forwarded to the City College School of Education no later than July 15, 1966.

Notification: Official notification will be mailed as soon as all phases of the evaluation procedure have been completed.

I HAVE APPLIED FOR A CONDITIONAL LICENSE IN:

1.________________Elementary Education: (Common Branches)

2.________________Secondary Education: (See Key on Last Page for Field Number)

A. Day High School________________ B. Junior High School________________

3. Undergraduate Studies (transcripts must list courses you are taking this term)

Name of School	Dates of Attendance	Degree	Date Granted or Expected

4. Graduate Studies (transcripts must list courses you are taking this term)

Name of School	Dates of Attendance	Degree	Date Granted or Expected

5. LIST UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EDUCATION COURSES. INCLUDE ALSO COURSES IN PSYCHOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY IF ANY. INCLUDE COURSES IN WHICH YOU MAY BE CURRENTLY REGISTERED.

Institution	Course Dept. and No.	Title	Date Completed	Grade	Credits

6. **TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATES FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHING:**
LIST THE COURSES YOU HAVE TAKEN IN THE SUBJECT YOU ARE PLANNING TO TEACH.*
(Use a separate sheet of paper if necessary.)

*For: English, include Speech
Science, include Mathematics
Social Studies, include Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Sociology

7. **TO BE COMPLETED BY CANDIDATES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHING.**
List the course you have taken in each of the following areas:
(Use a separate sheet of paper if necessary)

Area	Institution	Course Number and Title	Date Completed	Grade	Credits
English and Speech					
Mathematics					
Science Biology Chemistry Physics Geology Astronomy					
Social Studies History Economics Geography Pol. Science					
Art & Music					
Health or Physical Education					

8. **WHAT EXPERIENCE HAVE YOU HAD WORKING WITH CHILDREN?**

9. **Date__________ Signature____________________ Home Telephone_______________**

In the space provided on Page 1, indicate the number of the secondary school area in which you wish to prepare to teach:

DAY HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

1. **Biology and General Science**
2. **Chemistry and General Science**
3. **Mathematics**
4. **Physics and General Science**
5. **Spanish**

Special Subjects

6. **Accounting and Business Practice**
7. **Distributive Education**
8. **Fine Arts**
9. **Health Education (women)**
10. **Stenography and Typewriting (Gregg)**
11. **Stenography and Typewriting (Pitman)**

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

12. **English**
13. **General Science**
14. **Mathematics**
15. **Social Studies**

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

16. **Common Branches**

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL

STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT

Upon successful completion of the Summer Education Program for which the Board of Education is assuming the cost, I agree to:

1. Accept an assignment to a full-time, per annum substitute position in the New York City public school system for the school year beginning September 6, 1966 and ending June 30, 1967.

2. Take the additional 2-credit professional education course at The City College School of Education during the Fall 1966 semester - tuition to be paid by the Board of Education.

Signature of Applicant ________________________ Date ____________

Please Complete the Following Section:

I have filed an application with the Board of Examiners for a Conditional License as Substitute Teacher of ________________________
(Indicate Level and Subject)

NAME ________________________
(Please Print)

ADDRESS ________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ________________

NOTE: PLEASE ENCLOSE THIS STATEMENT ALONG WITH APPLICATION FOR EXAMINATION IN ENVELOPE TO BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Special Circular No. 2, 1966-67

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL

September 1, 1966

TO DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS AND
ALL DAY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

A. PROCEDURE FOR ASSIGNMENT OF CONDITIONAL SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS

Participants in the Intensive Teacher Training Program, upon the successful completion of their academic studies, will be granted licenses as conditional substitute teachers. This group of newly-licensed persons will then be available to augment the list of substitute teachers ordinarily on hand for assignment to the schools. Since the Board of Education is under a commitment to provide such licensees with full-time work during the 1966-1967 school year, it is incumbent upon the Office of Personnel, administrators of the districts and the officials of individual schools to utilize this complement of employees in the most efficient manner.

The following guidelines will govern the employment of the aforesaid persons:

1. Immediately after it has learned conclusively the names of the persons completing the Intensive Teacher Training Program who will be employable as conditional substitute teachers, the Central Placement Bureau shall:

   a. Assign as many as possible of these licensees to specific school vacancies.
   b. In consultation with the Coordinator of the Intensive Teacher Training Program, develop lists of the remaining prospective conditional substitute licensees for allocation to each of the thirty district superintendents, in accordance with the needs of the respective districts.
   c. Send notices of assignment instructing these remaining licensees to report to the various district offices on September 7, unless they are assigned, in the interim period, to a specific school vacancy. A copy of each such notice shall be transmitted to the appropriate district superintendent.
   d. Transfer substitutes from the pool in one district to that of another district, if necessary to meet school needs.
   e. Formalize the assignment, for purposes of record, after the district superintendent has placed a substitute from his pool in a full-term opening.

2. These conditional substitute teachers shall report on September 7, to the district office specified in the directions mailed to them.

3. District Superintendents shall,

   a. Place the conditional substitute teachers alloted to them, at their discretion, in the schools of the district, at the earliest possible date. For the first group of assignments, this should be accomplished on September 7 or September 8. Notifications of such placement shall be given to conditional substitute teachers in writing, on Form OP-2, and copies shall be sent to the Bureau of Appointments and to the principal of the involved school. A copy of this notice is enclosed. Note that the form calls for an indication of the type of assignment, whether full-term or to cover daily absences of teachers.

b. Report, on Form OP-2, whenever a substitute assigned to cover the daily absences of teachers is reassigned to a full-term opening.

c. Take such steps in regard to employment of per diem substitutes in schools as are necessary to insure full utilization of the district pool. Per diem substitutes are not to be hired on any day until each district pool substitute is assigned to cover the absence of a teacher on that day.

4. School Principals shall,

    a. Notify their district superintendents on September 7, of any full-term openings in their schools already known to them, for which the services of a regular substitute teacher will be required.
    b. Communicate immediately with their district superintendents as full-term openings develop after September 7.
    c. Obtain the approval of their district superintendents before making any regular assignments on September 21 and September 22, when this authority is granted to principals, in order to insure most effective use of the district pool.
    d. Inform their district superintendents if, on a given day, there is no absenteeism to permit the employment of a substitute assigned to the school from the district pool, so that the district superintendent may reassign the pool substitute for the day.

5. All I.T.T.P. conditional licensees assigned to the district pool will be construed, for the purpose of compensation, as regular substitute teachers and they will be paid on an annual salary basis. A conditional substitute who receives a regular assignment by September 22, will be placed on the payroll of the school to which he is assigned. If he has been placed previously by the district superintendent for temporary work at one of several other schools, the district superintendent shall decide the school payroll on which the teacher's name is to appear. He will be guided by the needs of the particular school or schools. Such teachers shall be considered above quota for the school and shall be handled, for payroll purposes, as described in Bureau of Finance Circular of Instructions for September Payrolls. It is essential that such a teacher be utilized for each day of the term in lieu of a per diem substitute whose employment would otherwise be authorized.

B. APPLICABILITY OF ABOVE PROCEDURE TO OTHER LICENSEES

1. The steps enumerated above, with respect to the assignment of conditional substitutes to districts and their employment within districts, shall be applicable also to certain unconditional substitutes who cannot be assigned to specific vacancies and may be included as part of a district pool.
2. In addition to the conditional licensees in the I.T.T.P., there will be several hundred others who completed the pedagogic courses independent of the I.T.T.P. The above procedures shall also be applicable to them.

Very truly yours,

THEODORE H. LANG
Deputy Superintendent

Special Circular No. 4, 1966-1967 - AMENDED

Please destroy first
circular No.4 dated
September 1, 1966

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

September 2, 1966

TO SUPERINTENDENTS, PRINCIPALS, DIRECTORS
AND HEADS OF BUREAUS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR NEWLY LICENSED TEACHERS

In order to increase teacher retention in our schools, we are initiating a stepped-up program of orientation and in-service training for new teachers with limited or no prior teaching experience. The facets of this program include: the use of three new teachers' and supervisors' training manuals, a two-credit course in Problems of Teaching to be given by City College to some 2,000 conditional licensees who completed the Intensive Teacher Training Program (I.T.T.P.) this summer, the organization of school workshops by experienced teachers for all new teachers without prior teaching experience, and the anticipated assignment of additional supervisory personnel.

Arrangements have been made for each district superintendent to receive the following publications:

1. Getting Started in the Elementary School
2. Getting Started in the Secondary School
3. Supervisor's Manual for Helping New Teachers

Delivery in sufficient quantities will be made on September 6th and 7th. Please distribute the manuals in time for use by teachers and supervisors at orientation sessions.

Conditional licensees, who have completed successfully the Pre-Service Training Program conducted cooperatively by the Board of Education and the City College School of Education during the summer of 1966, are scheduled for enrollment in special follow-up courses during the Fall semester. The courses offered are: "Problems of Teaching in Secondary Schools" for teachers in junior and senior high schools and "Problems in Elementary Schools" for teachers of Common Branches. One or more sections of these two courses will be held in each district. The superintendent should make available to City College classroom space for this purpose. Instructions concerning details of registration are contained in a communication from City College.

Plans are being made to hold after-school workshops in the schools for teachers without prior teaching experience who are engaged in teaching children from low-income areas. These teachers will meet in small groups for individual guidance, assistance, and training under the leadership of an experienced teacher. These workshops will be held on a regular basis throughout the school year for a maximum of 20 two-hour sessions.

The district superintendent has the responsibility to co-ordinate the program within the district: to stimulate proper use of the manuals and to aid in the supervision and training of all new teachers, particularly those teaching disadvantaged pupils.

Very truly yours,

Theodore H. Lang

THEODORE H. LANG
Deputy Superintendent

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

B-1

Code ____________

(Leave Blank)

THE CITY COLLEGE

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Intensive Teacher Training Program - Summer, Fall 1966
Inventory I

Name ____
Last First Middle Initial

Registration in ITTP Program (Circle One)

DAY HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

1. Biology and General Science
2. Chemistry and General Science
3. Mathematics
4. Physics and General Science
5. Spanish

Special Subjects

6. Accounting and Business Practice
7. Distributive Education
8. Fine Arts
9. Health Education (women)
10. Stenography and Typewriting (Gregg)
11. Stenography and Typewriting (Pitman)

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

12. English
13. General Science
14. Mathematics
15. Social Studies

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

16. Common Branches

PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF:

1. Age (Check One)

1 ☐ Under 25
2 ☐ 25-29
3 ☐ 30-34
4 ☐ 35-39
5 ☐ 40-44
6 ☐ 45-49
7 ☐ 50-54
8 ☐ 55-59
9 ☐ Over 59

2. Sex (Check One)

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

3. Marital Status (Check One)

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Widowed
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Separated

4. **Place of birth**____

(City, State, Country)

5. **Residence prior to ITTP Program**

____

(City, State, Country)

6. **If you have children, write their ages (to nearest year) on the line below. (List from oldest to youngest.)**

1_____ 2_____ 3_____ 4_____ 5_____ 6_____

7. **How many children were in your parental family (including yourself)?**

____

8. **Please check the highest level of education completed by:**

(a) **your father**

1 ☐ elementary (K-6) 4 ☐ 2 years college
2 ☐ junior high (7-9) 5 ☐ college graduate
3 ☐ senior high (10-12) 6 ☐ graduate school

(b) **your mother**

1 ☐ elementary (K-6) 4 ☐ 2 years college
2 ☐ junior high (7-9) 5 ☐ college graduate
3 ☐ senior high (10-12) 6 ☐ graduate school

9. **Was either of your parents a teacher? (Check One)**

1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no

10. **Is(Are) any other close relative(s) a teacher? (Check One)**

(a) 1 ☐ yes
2 ☐ no

(b) **If yes, please specify**______________________________

____

11. **Do you speak and read a foreign language? (Check One)**

(a) 1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

(b) If yes, please specify______________________________

____

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR TRAINING:

12. **As to degrees earned:**

Name of the Institution	Located in What State or Foreign Country	Degree	Major Field	Year Began	Year Completed

13. **How many years of training (college or university) have you completed beyond the Bachelor's Degree? (Consider 24 semester hours or equivalent equal to one year.)**

(Check One)

1 ☐ 0

2 ☐ 1/2

3 ☐ 1

4 ☐ 1-1/2

5 ☐ 2

6 ☐ 2-1/2

7 ☐ 3 or more

14. **When did you last take a course for college credit? (Indicate the year and semester.)**

____

15. **Were these latest credits in preparation for a degree or a diploma?**

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

16. Where did you live while attending:

a. Undergraduate School? (Check One)

1 ☐ at home

2 ☐ at school (dormitory, frat or sorority house)

3 ☐ other ____________________

b. Graduate School? (Check One)

1 ☐ at home

2 ☐ at school (dormitory, frat or sorority house)

3 ☐ Other ____________________

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE:

17. Describe your last employment prior to ITTP Program. (If housewife, please state.)

Job Title	Description of Work	No. of Years

18. Were you ever a member of a school board? (Check One)

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

19. Were you ever a PTA officer? (Check One)

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

20. Did you ever serve as a member of a public school-related committee? (Check One)

1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

21. **Have you ever worked, as an adult, with children's groups? (Check One)**

(a) 1 ☐ yes

2 ☐ no

(b) If yes, please specify ____

____

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
DIVISION OF TEACHER EDUCATION
OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Intensive Teacher Training Program - Summer, Fall 1966

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

Name ____
Last First Middle Initial

ITTP Section Taught (Circle One)

DAY HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

1. Biology and General Science
2. Chemistry and General Science
3. Mathematics
4. Physics and General Science
5. Spanish

Special Subjects

6. Accounting and Business Practice
7. Distributive Education
8. Fine arts
9. Health Education (women)
10. Stenography and Typewriting (Gregg)
11. Stenography and Typewriting (Pitman)

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

General Subjects

12. English
13. General Science
14. Mathematics
15. Social Studies

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

16. Common Branches

PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF:

1. Age (Check One)
   - 1 ☐ Under 25
   - 2 ☐ 25-29
   - 3 ☐ 30-34
   - 4 ☐ 35-39
   - 5 ☐ 40-44
   - 6 ☐ 45-49
   - 7 ☐ 50-54
   - 8 ☐ 55-59
   - 9 ☐ Over 59
2. Sex (Check One)
   - 1 ☐ Male
   - 2 ☐ Female
3. Marital Status (Check One)
   - 1 ☐ Single
   - 2 ☐ Married

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR TRAINING:

4. As to degrees earned:

Name of the Institution	Located in What State or Foreign Country	Degree	Major Field	Year Began	Year Completed

PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EXPERIENCE:

5. Years of Professional Experience: ____________________

6. Current Position

____
School or University

____
Rank or Title

7. Years of Experience with New York Public School System: ________________

PLEASE GIVE YOUR OPINIONS OF THE ITTP PROGRAM:

8. How well do you think your courses prepared the students to teach? (Check One)

1. ☐ Very well
2. ☐ adequately
3. ☐ less than adequately
4. ☐ poorly

9. How could you evaluate the motivation of the students in your classes? (Check One)

1. ☐ Very High
2. ☐ Average
3. ☐ Less than Average
4. ☐ Poor

Remarks:

10. What did you consider to be the most promising aspect of the program?

11. What did you consider to be the poorest or weakest aspect of the program?

12. **If you were to plan a future ITTP program, what would you add to the present program?**

13. **If you were to plan a future ITTP program, what would you delete from the present program?**

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Division of Teacher Education

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

ITTP PROJECT

ITTP INSTRUCTOR:

Enclosed is a set of questionnaires and a stamped addressed envelope. It is essential to the project evaluation that each student in your class completes the questionnaire.

Thank you for your continuing cooperation.

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Division of Teacher Education
Office of Research and Evaluation

Appointment Questionnaire
ITTP Project

Code________________
Leave Blank

1. Name____
Last First Middle Initial

2. Section Number (Summer Session)__________________ Elem. JHS. HS.
Number (Circle One)

3. Present Appointment:

(a) Name or Number of School or Office:____________________
(Borough)

(b) Address of School or Office:____________________

(c) Subjects or grade you are teaching: ____________________

____

____

____

4. Position if other than classroom Teacher: ____________________

5. Are you a member of a

a Teaching Cluster? __________ Yes __________ No

b Teaching Team? __________ Yes __________ No

6. Present ITTP Instructor ____________________

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Office of Personnel
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, N.Y., 11201

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS WHO HAVE DISCONTINUED SERVICE IN NEW YORK CITY SCHOOLS

ON-THE-JOB INFORMATION

Please check the following responses relating to the license on which you taught:

Level: H.S.________ JHS ________ Elem. ________ Other ________

Subject Area or Type of License (e.g. Social Studies or Early Childhood Educ.): ____________________________

Regular ______ Substitute (Met All Qualifications) ________ Cond. Sub. (ITTP) ________ Cond.Sub. (Non-ITTP) ________

Years of Full Time Teaching Experience in N.Y.C. Public Schools: ________

Other Schools: ________

Did you have Student Teaching? __________

School to Which Assigned:________________ Grade Level(s) or Year(s)__________

Type of Class: Difficult________________ Average ________________

Teaching in License? ____________Out of License? ___________ Both? ______

REASON OR REASONS FOR DISCONTINUANCE OF SERVICE

Place a (1) beside the most important reason for leaving. If you had other reasons place a (2) beside the reason next in importance, a (3) beside the third reason. Write in as many numbers as needed to fully describe your reasons.

Graduate Study______________________ Military Service ________________

Personal Illness____________________Transportation Difficulties ________

Illness in Family __________________Moved out of town ________________

Maternity___________________________Difficulty of School ______________

Child Care__________________________Difficulty of Assignment__________

Other Teaching Position:

a. In N.Y.C. Public School__________

b. Outside N.Y.C. Public School ______

Insufficient Preparation for Job_______

Lack of Professional Assistance on Job__________

Job other than Teaching ______________

Other(s) (Please Specify)____________

____

In the light of your experience on the job, what suggestions would you make to help new teachers?____

____

____

JOB PLANS

What are Your Plans for the Future?________________________________

____

Are you interested in a return to teaching?__________If so, when?_________
Yes or No

Under what conditions would you consider a return to teaching?____________

____

PERSONAL INFORMATION (Optional)

Name ____ Sex ________
Last First Middle Initial M or F

Home Address ________________________________ Telephone No.______

Marital Status: Single _____ Married ____ Other _____ # of children under 15 _______

Age: 20-29______ 30-39______ 40-49 _____ 50-59______ 60-69______ 70 ______

EDUCATION	INSTITUTION	DATES
Bachelor's Degree (4 Yr.)		
Master's Degree		
Doctorate		
Other		

OP 8 4.67

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
535 East Eightieth Street
New York, New York 10021

Division of Teacher Education

March 3, 1967

Dear ITTP Graduate:

For the past seven months you have been involved in an experiment which has very important implications to the field of teacher education.

At various times throughout the program you have been asked to furnish us with information to enable us to evaluate this important program. Since you are no longer enrolled in formal ITTP classes it is necessary for us to contact you at your home address.

The enclosed questionnaires were designed to give us information about your present second semester appointment and a sample of your opinions about your beginning teaching experiences. Please complete both questionnaires by filling out the information directly on the enclosed forms. Separate answer sheets have not been provided.

Form IV was supposed to have been filled out prior to the end of the Fall course, but was delayed in the mail and arrived too late for some classes. If you are one of the few who have already completed and turned in Form IV, please disregard that form and return only Form V.

Please return the completed forms in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. If your reply is not received during the next two weeks, it will be necessary for us to write to you again.

Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Maurice A. Lohman
Assistant Professor
Office of Research and Evaluation

es

Enclosures (3)

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Division of Teacher Education
Office of Research and Evaluation

Intensive Teacher Training Program - Summer, Fall 1966

Inventory IV

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of 28 multiple choice statements designed to sample opinions about your beginning teaching experiences. There is considerable variation as to the kinds of experiences encountered by new teachers. What is wanted is your feeling about your own individual experiences. There are, of course, no "right"or "wrong" answers.

Read each statement and decide which one of the three choices best indicates how YOU feel. Then circle the number of your choice.

Your opinions about your beginning teaching experiences will, of course, be held strictly confidential. The data will be used for research purposes only.

PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM

1. I feel that the contributions I made to the class activity as a whole:

    1. were not usually very effective.
    2. were constructive and helpful.
    3. were too infrequent to be effective.

2. In general, I thought the behavior of the pupils I taught was:

    1. too subdued.
    2. too rowdy.
    3. satisfactory.

3. The comments made by my supervisors regarding my mistakes were:

    1. just critical enough to be helpful.
    2. overly critical.
    3. not critical enough.

4. My teaching experience left me with a feeling that teaching is:

    1. somewhat unorganized.
    2. very challenging and interesting.
    3. a little too routine.

5. When discussing my teaching performance with me, my supervisor was:

   1. too critical.
   2. not critical enough.
   3. just critical enough.

6. The intelligence level of most of the pupils I taught:

   1. was lower than I would have liked.
   2. was just about what I like to have.
   3. was higher than I would have liked.

7. A comparison of what I strived for and what I attained in teaching my pupils made me:

   1. feel that I may have expected too much of myself.
   2. feel a sense of accomplishment.
   3. feel a bit discouraged.

8. In preparing me to become a member of the teaching profession, this experience has left me with a feeling of being:

   1. unqualified to be a teacher.
   2. barely prepared to teach in the schools.
   3. adequately prepared to teach in the schools.

9. My personal relationships with staff members at the school:

   1. were very pleasant and cordial.
   2. were distant and impersonal.
   3. were somewhat unsatisfying.

10. My supervisors' interest in my professional improvement and growth was:

    1. somewhat superficial.
    2. sincere and helpful.
    3. intensive to the point of being annoying.

11. The regulations to which I had to conform seemed:

    1. unnecessary in many respects.
    2. rather vague but not unreasonable.
    3. reasonable and agreeable to me.

12. The assignments given to me by my supervisors:

    1. were about as varied as they should be.
    2. were too varied to learn any one aspect of teaching.
    3. were not varied enough to broaden my experience.

13. In discussions with my supervisor, my viewpoint:

    1. was accepted too often without adequate understanding.
    2. was accepted and understood practically all of the time.
    3. was seldom accepted.

14. My own plans for using methods and materials:

    1. were accepted a little too often.
    2. were employed often enough.
    3. were not employed often enough.

15. The pupils I had in my class:

    1. seemed indifferent to school activities.
    2. mildly resisted my attempts to teach them.
    3. were easily motivated.

16. The amount of clerical work given to me was:

    1. too little for me to learn this aspect of the teaching job.
    2. appropriate and helpful.
    3. a little more than I considered necessary.

17. As I evaluate my ITTP experience in light of my other college work, I am convinced that it:

    1. was one of my least valuable courses.
    2. was the most valuable course I have taken.
    3. was about as valuable as my other college courses.

18. My supervisor's suggestions were:

    1. of little help to me.
    2. too demanding of my time.
    3. reasonable and helpful.

19. This first teaching experience gave me a feeling of:

    1. personal inadequacy in some respects.
    2. achievement and personal satisfaction.
    3. discouragement with the gap between educational theory and practice.

20. In general, the atmosphere of the school to which I was assigned was:

    1. too easygoing for maximum learning by children.
    2. about as democratic as it should be.
    3. overly dominated by the administration.

21. I found that my personal relationships with school personnel prompted me to:

    1. just coast along until the end of the semester.
    2. consider postponement of my teaching career.
    3. put forth a great deal of effort.

22. Ideally I would like to teach pupils whose socio-economic background is:

    1. lower than the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.
    2. about the same as the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.
    3. higher than the socio-economic background of those whom I taught.

23. My Fall ITTP classwork:

1. was proportioned according to the amount of time I had available.
2. was not too considerate of the amount of work I had to do in teaching.
3. did not require enough time to keep me busy.

24. The methods of teaching adhered to by my supervisors:

1. were too subject-centered to meet the needs of enough children.
2. were too child-centered to effectively teach the necessary subject matter.
3. were appropriate for obtaining the desired pupil growth.

25. When planning classroom activities, my supervisors:

1. sometimes assigned the planning to me but often ignored my efforts.
2. usually had me participate in the planning with them.
3. seldom gave me a chance to participate in the planning.

26. The goals toward which I was striving in my teaching:

1. were generally attained to my satisfaction.
2. were seldom attained to my satisfaction.
3. were probably not appropriate to the pupils I taught.

27. The kinds of activities in which pupils in my class participated:

1. were too routine to stimulate the interests of the children.
2. were about like those I desired.
3. were lacking in purpose and meaning for most of the children.

28. The skills I learned during my first year teaching:

1. should be of enormous value to my future teaching performance.
2. will probably be unimportant to my future teaching performance.
3. were actually too few in number to affect my future teaching.

How would you rate your satisfaction with the following aspects of your work?

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
29. salary	1	2	3	4
30. teaching load	1	2	3	4
31. respect and recognition from community	1	2	3	4
32. respect and recognition from superiors	1	2	3	4
33. relations with pupils	1	2	3	4
34. relations with parents	1	2	3	4
35. supervisory assistance	1	2	3	4
36. intellectual stimulation	1	2	3	4
37. teaching materials	1	2	3	4
38. class size	1	2	3	4
39. extra class duties	1	2	3	4

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
Division of Teacher Education
Office of Research and Evaluation

Form V. ITTP Program

Code ____________
Leave Blank

1. **Name** ______________________________
Last **First** **Middle Initial**

2. **Grade Level:** **Elem.** **JHS.** **IS.** **H.S.**
(Circle One)

3. **Second Semester Appointment:**

   (a) **Name or Number of School or Office:** ____________
   (Borough)

   (b) **Address of School or Office:** ____________

   (c) **Subjects or grade you are teaching:** ____________

4. **Position if other than classroom Teacher:** ____________

5. **Is this the same position you held during your first semester?** ____ **Yes** ____ **No**

6. **What do you think were the major strengths of the ITTP program? (If more space is needed, write on the back page.)**

7. **What do you think were the major weaknesses of the ITTP program? (If more space is needed, write on the back page.)**

B-9

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

THEODORE H. LANG
DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

March 23, 1967

TO: PRINCIPALS OF ALL DAY SCHOOLS

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Since September 1966 you have had one or more Intensive Teacher Training Program (ITTP) graduates assigned to your staff as a conditional substitute teacher.

We are presently engaged in an extensive evaluation of this program from which important decisions relating to revision and improvement of the program will be made. This evaluation is dependent upon an assessment of the performance of each ITTP teacher who was assigned to your staff during the Fall semester.

Since we are interested in a total evaluation, it will not be necessary for you to identify the teacher by name on the rating form. However, please fill out one form for each teacher on the enclosed list of ITTP teachers.

Please return the completed forms on or before April 5, 1967 to:

Joseph A. Mandina
Office of Personnel
Room 612
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

T.H. Lang

THEODORE H. LANG
Deputy Superintendent

Office of Personnel
New York City Public Schools
ITTP Teacher Evaluation

Please describe the performance of this ITTP teacher by encircling the word Yes, No or Noto in response to each of the following items. Noto means no opportunity to observe; please use this response as infrequently as possible. Please answer all items.

This Teacher	Circle the Appropriate Answer		
1. Knows the subject (in his major teaching assignment) well enough to teach it.	Yes	No	Noto
2. Is getting good results with his pupils.	Yes	No	Noto
3. Shows a positive influence on pupils in developing character, citizenship and positive attitudes.	Yes	No	Noto
4. Organizes the work well.	Yes	No	Noto
5. Is enthusiastic and conscientious about his work.	Yes	No	Noto
6. Has a stable, well-adjusted personality.	Yes	No	Noto
7. Is mature.	Yes	No	Noto
8. Has a good attitude toward supervision. Examples: Wants help, accepts criticism, alert to suggestions, tries out new ideas.	Yes	No	Noto
9. Takes part in the after school workshop program.	Yes	No	Noto
10. Is a loyal staff member.	Yes	No	Noto
11. Fits into the school staff well; is liked by other teachers.	Yes	No	Noto
12. Is liked by pupils.	Yes	No	Noto
13. Has exhibited growth on the job.	Yes	No	Noto

14. **Remarks**

If this teacher has particular strengths or weaknesses not adequately covered above, or if there are special circumstances which you think are important in accounting for his success or lack of it, please mention them in this space below.

15. **Summary Evaluation of Teacher's Effectiveness:**

In comparison with beginning teachers generally, I would say that this teacher is (place a check mark in the appropriate box):

☐ Unsatisfactory

☐ Below Average

☐ Average

☐ Above Average

☐ Excellent

---

1. Is this teacher still teaching in your school?

   ______ Yes ______ No

2. Did this teacher teach in the area of his (her) training

   ______ Yes ______ No

3. How would you rate the difficulty of this teacher's assignment?

   ______ Average ______ Difficult ______ Very Difficult

____
Name of Principal

____
School